

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1883.

The Week.

BILLS adapting the Civil-Service Reform Act, recently passed by Congress and approved by the President, to the requirements of the State Government, have been introduced in both houses of the Pennsylvania Legislature. Mr. J. Wilton Brooks offered a resolution looking to the same end in the Assembly of this State. A bill providing for the appointment of a commission to examine into the condition of the State service and report to what classes of officers and employees civil-service rules would be applicable, was introduced in the same body by Mr. Miller some time ago. Another carefully-prepared bill, providing for the introduction of such rules in the State offices, and also opening the way to their introduction in the municipal governments of our largest cities, is likely to be offered at an early day. We are informed that a good many of the Democratic members of our Legislature are rather demonstratively displaying their opposition to such a movement, seeking to create the impression that no measure of the kind can pass. The friends of civil-service reform at Albany should not permit themselves to be discouraged by such demonstrations. If the Democrats want to take the responsibility of defeating a movement for civil-service reform in this State, let them by all means have an opportunity to do so by their votes. Some of them will think differently when the time comes, as a good many did in Congress as soon as the question bluntly confronted them.

From Pennsylvania comes a very interesting story, which will delight Mr. Jay Hubbell's heart. Last summer, when the struggle between the Republican Independents and the Cameron Machine was impending, the postmaster at Steelton, near Harrisburg, Pa., an Independent, was removed to make room for a Stalwart, Mr. Augustus Nebinger. This gentleman was committed to the Dauphin County Jail last Saturday on the charge of having begun embezzling money belonging to the money-order department, soon after his accession to office. The amount is stated at \$1,200. Mr. Nebinger now says that he appropriated a great part of this sum for his country's good. Believing in the doctrine that a public officer is appointed not only to do his duty to the community, but also to his party, and that the party has a right to levy upon the compensation paid by the Government to its servants for the benefit of the campaign-chest, Mr. Nebinger thought he might just as well defray his party assessment, as well as some other campaign expenses—for instance, the cost of a supper and drinks for political friends—directly out of the public fund. He evidently did his duty to the party according to the moral notions which the assessment system had developed in his mind. Now that he is in jail for it, Mr. Hubbell and Senator Cameron should make an effort to help him out and to protect him against the

unfortunate consequences of his excessive zeal. It is a fair question whether Mr. Nebinger was able to satisfy the demands of the party out of his own means, and whether, as the party managers would not take no for an answer, he could satisfy them in any other way than by stealing.

There has been, during the week, a general advance in prices of breadstuffs in all markets, domestic and foreign, in consequence of the general realization that the crops of 1882 had been everywhere overestimated, and that the world's surplus of wheat and other grains was not more than sufficient to keep up stocks in store until new crops should be distributed next summer. The very unfavorable condition and small area of wheat planted throughout Europe last autumn also indicate short crops there next summer. Exports of all articles of domestic production are larger than at this time last year, and on the exchange of commodities alone the balance of foreign trade would be in our favor, and therefore in favor of a movement of specie this way from Europe. The growing ease of money here, however, has induced the payment of a good many sterling loans. Moreover, for some weeks past the United States Mortgage Company has been returning a large part of its capital to England to take up the six per cent. mortgage bonds which were the means by which its capital was raised there for loan in this country. The company finds that it cannot loan the capital in this country on real-estate mortgages, even at the West, for more than 6 per cent., and hence must have the capital at lower rates of interest. There has also been some selling of American stocks by foreign holders during the past week. All these features have helped to make a demand for foreign exchange which has kept up the rates.

The course of the stock market has been disappointing to almost every one interested. During the first half of last week, and until Friday, it gradually advanced, and there was an increase of business, which for a time assumed the appearance of the usual general advance resulting from the increase of money at this season of the year. But on Friday the market was less confident, and from that time until Tuesday there was a break in first one stock and then another, until on Tuesday afternoon there was a general decline, measured by the fall in Denver from 51½ to 46½. The cause of this reaction and decline seems to be a feeling that there must be a further liquidation in the stock market before the basis is reached for a healthy upward reaction. The earnings of the railroads were never larger than they were in December, and (aside from the obstruction to business by heavy snows at the West) the prospect for a continuance of a larger business than ever before was never so good. The general commercial situation also has been improved very much in the last three weeks. There is now a prevailing confidence

that the worst has been realized, and that any change that may come will be for the better.

The reflection of Mr. Hoar to the Senate will, after a survey of the availabilities in the field against him, be generally accepted as the most satisfactory thing that could have happened. Undoubtedly Mr. Hoar has, by his course on several important questions, incurred the disfavor of many of his constituents, while he was at the same time fiercely assailed by the Stalwart element in Massachusetts. It is not improbable that the opposition he met with among the more liberal and progressive elements of his party, as well as the discussion which the contest called forth in the press, must have convinced him that his vote for the River and Harbor Bill, his narrow minded attitude on the tariff question, and the demonstrations of an acrid partisan spirit, of which he sometimes was guilty, came very near proving fatal to his political career, and that some reflection on these things on his part, now that he is reflected, would be wholesome with a view to the future. The rumor about the forging of a telegraphic message, as an agency in carrying the decisive number of votes to his side, was promptly disproved. Such rumors could not have touched his character anyhow.

Governor Butler has passed most of his political life in making "charges," and has, as a general rule, got them widely circulated. Probably no Governor's message was ever more widely circulated and read than the one he delivered to the Massachusetts Legislature the other day. No paper in the State failed to produce it in full, and it contained little besides charges. The nearly successful effort of his friends in the Legislature, therefore, to get 10,000 copies of it, instead of 2,000, the usual number, printed at the expense of the State, seems unworthy of the man and the occasion. It would not bring the message to the notice of a single human being, probably, who had not already read it, and would give the printer some of the taxpayers' money, for which better uses might be found. It looked, in fact, extremely like a job, and nothing is more melancholy than to see a reform administration begin with a job. It is also depressing to find a Governor who began his official life by going round to see if the public offices were open punctually in the morning, leaving the State himself to attend to his private business in Washington. But Governor Butler's great function in politics has, after all, been to make fun for "the boys," and this he performs, even when he is most disappointing as a reformer.

The decision of the Supreme Court of this district, in the railroad mandamus proceedings begun by the Attorney-General last summer, is carefully limited by Judge Davis to the precise facts presented. The case, as stated by him, is this: A class of "skilled workmen" (*i. e.*, freight-handlers), in the employ of the Central and Erie Roads, "refused to work un-

less their wages were increased three cents an hour"; the companies "refused to grant the increase of wages demanded"; the workmen then struck; and "the companies thereafter did not or could not perform their duties to the public." These facts, he says, are all that are presented by "the papers," and they reduce the question before the Court to this: "Can railway companies refuse or neglect to perform their public duties upon a controversy with their employees over the cost of doing them?"—and the answer given by the Court is: "The excuse has in law no validity. The duties imposed must be performed at whatever cost. The companies cannot abandon their public duties without the express consent of the State." Consequently, the decision of Judge Haight below, that no relief could be had, was overruled.

At the same time, however, it is suggested that cases may arise to which this rule would not apply: "If it had been shown that the strikes had been caused or compelled by some illegal combination, which had sought to force its will upon the companies, and that the companies had refused to obey unjust and illegal dictation, and had made the best efforts to employ other workmen, a very different case for the exercise of the discretion of the Court would have been presented." A reference is made in another portion of the opinion to the entire absence of any evidence of "violence, or riot, or interference with the other employees of the companies." From all this we may infer that in cases like that of the interference with the traffic on the Pennsylvania Railroad during the Pittsburgh riots of 1877, or, in general, where transportation of freight becomes an impossibility, the remedy by mandamus will not be enforced. The sum and substance of the decision is that a railroad company, by accepting its charter, undertakes a public duty, with all the ordinary risks attendant upon it, including that of strikes, and that the public at large has an interest in the performance of this duty which may be enforced summarily by the courts. The general current of judicial decision, indeed, in this country and in England left no escape from this conclusion. It will be seen from the opinion that the right to mandamus will always depend, to a great extent, upon the circumstances of each case as it arises. The freight-handlers' strike is long since over, and the chief importance of the decision lies in the establishment of a rule for the future. The rule, as we understand it, is that railroad companies in this State may be compelled to perform their ordinary duty as common carriers, notwithstanding a strike, when they do not show that it is an impossibility, or cannot show that they have made their best efforts, to employ other workmen.

We print elsewhere a letter, on the homicide question at the South, which has been addressed to and published in the *Richmond State* by one of the gentlemen, Professor Hoge, of the Hampden-Sidney College, whose anonymous contributions to our own columns brought on them the unmeasured denunciation of that journal. Professor Hoge had simply acknowledged the truth of

our charges and deplored it, and for this was threatened with some kind of social ostracism, as a "slanderer of his people." His admirable letter to the *State*, which it very honorably prints, is a review of the controversy, in which all its main points are presented with great clearness and force. We are glad to see it appear in a Southern paper, because it may prove the beginning of a Southern agitation on the subject. Professor Hoge suggests that if the Southern press would take it up, probably the *Nation* would be willing to leave it in its hands. We can assure him that nothing would please us better than to hand the matter over completely to Southern writers and orators determined to assert within the South the right to "utter and to argue freely" on all social questions, and determined through utterance and argument to rid Southern society of the great stain of unpunished homicide.

The *Standard of the Cross*, published at Cleveland, O., and the *Southern Churchman*, of Richmond, Va., both organs of the Episcopal Church, have been discussing Southern homicide. Nothing can be better than the temper in which the *Churchman* deals with the subject, and in which it speaks of our own share in the discussion. But it seeks to meet the strictures of the *Standard of the Cross* by statistics of crime taken from the *Telegram* of this city, which go to show that the North surpasses the South both in the number of murders and in the number of unpunished murders in proportion to population. As several Southern papers have produced these same figures, taken either from the *Telegram* or the *New York Tribune*, in answer to our charges, we must here observe, once for all, that we have instituted inquiries into their source, and that we believe it to be simply chance clipping from newspapers, made, we do not know when or by whom, and that they have absolutely no weight or authority, and that it is absurd to cite them or talk of them as statistics. Mr. Redfield's book was, on the contrary, made up with care, and in large part from official records, and its authority has never, to our knowledge, been successfully impugned.

A correspondent and subscriber writes to us from Virginia that the ball in Bedford County, in that State, described in our last issue, at which one Clayton had his throat cut on the spot for speaking tartly to one of the "débutantes," Miss Idelle Read, was "a mere gathering of the lowest order of negroes." We need hardly say we are delighted to hear this, because it takes the case out of the category of social homicides. But we must call attention to the highly praiseworthy conduct of the assassin, Mr. Armistead Barksdale, in shooting himself the next day. That this poor negro should have perceived so clearly and so promptly that this world was no place for a brutal murderer, and have taken himself out of it without any expense to the county, must bring a blush to the cheek of many a white man whose hands are stained with unpunished bloodshedding.

The *Richmond (Va.) State* has the following fierce little retort:

"The *New York Nation* said lately, in defence of its bitter, South-hating articles, that it once took the part of the South when it cost something to do so. We suppose that it now attacks the South because it pays to do so. The *Nation* is evidently seeking to retrieve its losses."

If we were near the editor, who is evidently very angry, he would probably riddle us with buckshot, or "cut" us with a butcher-knife; but this being impossible, he says the most bitter things that occur to him. The notion that if you remonstrate with people for trying to kill each other, it must be because you expect to make money by it, is characteristic in its truly savage simplicity. It is an explanation that would suggest itself to nobody but a barbarian, and a gloomy barbarian at that. A cheerful, humorous barbarian would never think of such a thing.

Lord Granville's circular to the Powers, giving an account of what England has done, and proposes to do, in Egypt, contains the proposal that the Suez Canal shall be placed under the protection of international law as an arm of the sea, open to all vessels, and no fighting to be allowed within it, or, we presume, within a marine league of either end. Of course, however, this plan assumes that the banks are to be properly policed in the interest of neutrals, for the owners of Egypt might otherwise block it. The *Spectator*, commenting on it, says with much simplicity: "If we are at war, we have an unbroken, open waterway from Southampton to Bombay, and can fight in any part of it except the Canal." It must be satisfactory to the British voter to know that his fighting privileges are not to be curtailed, and that he will, no matter what disposition is made of the Canal, still be able to fight all the way from Southampton to Suez on this side, and all the way from Suez to Bombay on the other. We suspect this is really also the view which the British Foreign Office takes of Mr. Blaine's Panama Canal. It is quite willing to let him do what he pleases on the Canal, as long as it retains the privilege of fighting outside, because it is shrewd enough to know that an inter-oceanic canal, which you cannot leave because an enemy holds the sea outside, is for practical purposes a useless piece of property. It may afford fine opportunities for picnics and excursions in steam launches, but for commerce it would be worth very little. A funnier operation than fortifying its banks—which, we believe, is one of the things Mr. Blaine wants to do—could under such circumstances hardly be conceived, because you would also have the forts entirely to yourself, and their value would be wholly ornamental. Any canal can be blocked to a hostile vessel by the cheap expedient of sinking in it a barge full of stones.

The superiority of the Repression Act, as a means of stopping assassination and outrage in Ireland, over Mr. Forster's Coercion Act is daily becoming more manifest. The change of venue in criminal cases from the county towns to Dublin, and the trial before a city jury, has secured conviction in several of the worst cases, and these convictions have so demoralized the criminal class, which really seems to be a small one after all, that inform-

ers are now offering themselves in abundance. An association of assassins somewhat like the Pennsylvania Molly Maguires seems to have existed in Dublin for some time, and there is little doubt that such murders as that of Lord Mountmorres and that of the Joyce family were executed under the direction of emissaries sent out by it, while the Phoenix Park murders, and the attack on Field, the juror, were executed by the head men themselves in Dublin. Of course, the difficulty such men have in keeping faith with each other is enormous. Convictions of murderers shake the nerves of murderers still undetected who have had accomplices, and large rewards, such as have been offered in the Field and Cavendish cases, greatly increase the temptation to each man to get rid of his anxiety and get the money, by making a clean breast of it, especially as he does not know the day he will be anticipated by one of his confederates. The strain on the nerves of these Dublin wretches for some months back must have been terrible, and it is no wonder that some of them have now found it unbearable. Unhappily those who made the attack on the juror Field cannot be hanged, as he has survived his injuries, but the assassins of Lord Frederick Cavendish are apparently in sight, and not very far off.

At the same time, it must be said that, if we are to judge from a recent speech of Lord Hartington's, his wing of the Liberals is likely, when Mr. Gladstone is out of the way, to mix up the question of Irish Home Rule and Irish crime and outrage in the old hodge-podge of which the results have been so bitter for both England and Ireland. The plan on which the government of Ireland has been conducted for two centuries is to treat the lawlessness produced by grievances as a reason why grievances should not be redressed, although assassination, brigandage, and sympathy with criminals have been always the world over, and not in Ireland only, the consequences and accompaniments of misgovernment. Lord Hartington now says that Home Rule is not to be thought of. If this view should be put forward prominently by the Liberal party, the result will probably be that Home Rule will be thought of more than ever in Ireland, the only place in which thinking of it does any harm, and will drive all moderate Irish members out of public life, and return so large a body of Home-Rulers to the next Parliament that they will hold the balance of power, and make legislation impossible without a coalition of the two English parties. If there be any plain inference deducible from Irish political history, it is that Irish discontent has a tenacity fully as great as that of English power, and that, no matter how much cool persistence Englishmen may have, they will find their match among Irish traitors. The contest has lasted now so long, with nothing but sorrow and damage on both sides, that there is something pitiful in hearing Englishmen like Lord Derby and Lord Hartington gravely advising that it be kept up.

The Fenians in this city and elsewhere are now trying to repudiate connection with the

Dublin assassins, and probably can truly say that the Fenian organization does not preach or countenance assassination. But it does preach and exist for the promotion of outrages which are always close on assassination, such as explosions, burnings, and so forth, and which the bulk of its ignorant members do not distinguish from assassination, and which can rarely be carried out without the destruction of life, and which its rascally chiefs, though they call these "war," can hardly be dunderheaded enough to consider "war" themselves. Moreover, although they have had numerous opportunities of denouncing the Irish murderers, and separating themselves from them, the Fenians have never done so. They have, on the contrary, made common cause with them in the eyes of the civilized world, and disgraced the Irish name by denouncing and vituperating the magistrates, police, judges, jury, and everybody concerned in bringing these wretches to justice. In fact, they seem to be engaged in making the sympathy of the civilized world with the Irish cause dependent on their winning it over to the belief that assassination is a good and praiseworthy thing. Finally, although it is true that all Fenians are not Irish assassins, it is very certain that there is no Irish assassin who is not a Fenian.

Lord Dufferin has made another step in advance with the Egyptian question by drawing up a scheme of government which is to contain some of the features of the parliamentary system. The Khedive is to have a council of twelve "responsible ministers," and then there is to be a Legislative Council of fourteen, half nominated by the Khedive and half chosen by some system of double election which is not described in the despatches, beyond saying that "abundant precedents for it exist in the American Constitution and others." Besides these, there is to be an elective Assembly of forty-four members, to be occasionally convened to discuss certain subjects. This last one is not to take part in legislation, but simply "to give voice to classes hitherto inarticulate." In case the Ministerial Council and the Legislative Council do not agree, the Khedive is to decide. There is evidently some mystification, however, about the term "responsible ministry." All ministers, under every form of government, are responsible to somebody. In fact, the term "minister" implies responsibility. Under the worst despotisms the ministers are responsible, but as they are only responsible to the despot, it does the people no good. Ministerial responsibility is considered valuable in a modern state only if it is responsibility to a representative legislature. It does not appear that the proposed Egyptian responsibility is to be of this kind. If the Ministers differ with the Legislative Council, they are not to go out of office. The Khedive is to decide between them, which means, of course, that they are to be responsible to the Khedive, inasmuch as if he decides in their favor they are to have their way. But the old Egyptian Ministers were responsible to the Khedive, so that under this head the country will gain nothing by the new constitution.

It is difficult to say what the Legislative Council will amount to in practice, but it can-

not amount to very much, inasmuch as the Khedive is to nominate half of its members, and they will be naturally made of just the same materials as the Ministry. Against both the Ministry and these seven, the remaining seven, who are to be chosen by double election, are not likely to have much weight, even if they ever attempt any opposition or criticism at all. About the body which is to "give voice to classes hitherto inarticulate," perhaps the less said the better. The inarticulate classes in Egypt are subject to the bastinado for every variety of offence—for not paying their taxes, for not paying their debts, for being saucy to public functionaries, for being late at forced labor, and they take it without any consciousness of disgrace or oppression. It will evidently need a good deal of moral and mental elevation to give inarticulate persons of this kind much desire to make themselves heard in the way of complaint. One might feel hopeful about this scheme, complicated as it is, by considering it as the beginning of genuine parliamentary institutions, if the Khedive were the kind of man who could be expected to nurse it into vigor and maturity. But all that is known of him warrants the belief that he has little if any force of character, and that he is likely to be hereafter what he has been heretofore—the weak and vacillating tool of those who surround him, with but little interest in institutions of any kind, so that the new constitution, if adopted, will probably have just as much vigor as English influence and support give it. If England chooses to stand by and see that the Legislative Council has legitimate influence, and that the members of the Assembly of Forty-four are not flogged when they get home for giving tongue too freely, it may grow into something like self-government.

The French Ministry has resolved to expel Prince Napoleon, but not to take up any position with regard to the members of other dynastic families, and to remain neutral as to the Floquet bill. This bill will probably not pass, as its operation would undoubtedly be both cruel and unjust to the Orleans princes, who are living in a very quiet and inoffensive way, and some of whom are serving in the Army. The propriety of expelling even Prince Napoleon is very doubtful. There is no place in which he will be so harmless as in France. The situation is being made a little more theatrical by the reported discovery of a great Legitimist and Catholic conspiracy for the beginning of a civil war in the west of France, under the command of Charette, a fanatical Monarchist politician. The Legitimists have been growing increasingly bold of late, under the good-natured indifference with which the Government regarded them, and they have at some of their banquets talked very plainly of the necessity of taking up arms to suppress the Republican iniquity. It is not unlikely that these threats and disturbances will now multiply. The Republic has just reached the period in its life when all French Governments find the ground under their feet become unsteady. The task before it is to outlive the twentieth year, which, since 1793, no régime has ever surpassed.

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

(WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1883, TO TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1883, INCLUSIVE.)

DOMESTIC.

On Monday the United States Supreme Court rendered a decision that Section 5519 of the Revised Statutes, relating to conspiracy to deprive any person of equal protection of the laws, is unconstitutional. The ground of the decision is that the law infringes upon the reserved rights of the States; that there is nothing in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution that confers authority upon Congress to enact such a law; that if Congress had jurisdiction sufficient to punish private persons for the commission of one class of crimes in a State, by virtue of the same authority it would have the power to legislate as to all crimes in a State. The decision is believed to affect a vital part of the Civil Rights Law.

Senatorial election contests have proceeded during the week in a number of States with peculiar and persistent stubbornness. In Massachusetts two ballots were taken on Wednesday with no result, Senator Hoar gaining two votes on the second, and being within eight votes of an election. On the first ballot, Thursday morning, Senator Hoar was re-elected, receiving 148 votes, nine more than a majority. All but two of the Crapo men voted for him. This gave rise to a rumor that the change had been effected through a forged despatch, purporting to be from Mr. Crapo, requesting his supporters to vote for Mr. Hoar. A thorough sifting of the report shows that no underhand methods were used to secure the Crapo votes. Governor Culom, of Illinois, was elected Senator by the Republicans on Wednesday, and Senator Plumb, of Kansas, was renominated unanimously by the Republicans of the Kansas Legislature. Deadlocks on the election of Senators still continue in the Legislatures of Minnesota, Michigan, Nebraska, and Colorado. On Tuesday Senator McPherson (Dem.) was reelected by both houses of the N. J. Legislature, John E. Kenna (Dem.) was elected by the West Virginia Legislature, and Senator Coke (Dem.) reelected in Texas. Joint sessions have yet to ratify the first two.

In the Senate, on Wednesday, a bill was introduced by Mr. Edmunds, of Vermont, providing for the appointment of a commission to investigate the subject of railroad transportation. The Post-office Appropriation Bill was further considered, an animated debate resulting on the paragraph appropriating \$185,000 for special mail facilities on trunk lines. It was passed on Thursday. After a long debate on a motion, during the consideration of the Tariff Bill, reducing the duty from 60 to 50 per cent. *ad valorem* on china, porcelain, parian, and bisque ware, it was defeated by a close vote. The Senate continued to debate the Tariff and Post-office Appropriation Bills on Friday. The latter was passed on Saturday. It contains a provision for two-cent letter postage after July 1, 1883. On Monday there was an effort to hasten the Tariff Bill by a resolution for night sessions, but no agreement was reached. There was a sensation during the debate caused by the production of letters written by Mr. Kenner, of the Tariff Commission, showing the strong bias for protection to certain interests with which he did his work in the Commission. On Monday, during the Tariff debate, an amendment was carried to put all lumber and timber, except what is in a finished state, upon the free list. Tuesday was spent in debate on the metal schedule.

In the House of Representatives on Friday a bill was reported which proposes an important change in the methods of paying for expedition on Star-routes, and amends the existing law, under which Star-route frauds became possible. On Saturday the House considered the Naval Appropriation Bill in

Committee of the Whole, and continued the debate on Monday.

A caucus of the Republican Representatives in Congress was held on Friday afternoon at which, on motion of Speaker Keifer, it was resolved that the Republicans would proceed to consider the Tariff Bill in the House on Tuesday, immediately after the Naval Appropriation Bill had been disposed of, and that it should have preference over all other legislation, excepting appropriation bills. Mr. Haskell, of Kansas, made a statement in regard to the Ways and Means Committee's bill. He estimated the total reductions on the basis of last year's importations as follows: Sugar, \$12,000,000 to \$15,000,000; wool and woollen goods, \$3,000,000; silk, \$3,000,000; metals, \$2,000,000, nearly.

The House Committee on Public Buildings has recommended the purchase of the house in Washington in which President Lincoln died, for a sum not exceeding \$12,000.

On Wednesday the National Republican Committee met in Washington, delegates being present from most of the States and Territories. Mr. Dorsey's resignation as Secretary was accepted, and Mr. Martin, of Kansas, was elected to fill the place. Mr. Wm. E. Chandler presented the report of a special committee appointed to prepare a plan for the choice of delegates to the next National Republican Convention. He submitted a number of plans to be voted on seriatim. Senator Logan moved as a substitute for all the new propositions that the basis of representation shall remain as heretofore, and his motion was adopted by a vote of 23 to 15. This makes the Convention consist of two delegates for each Senator, two for each member of Congress, two delegates for each Territory, and two for the District of Columbia. The four delegates-at-large for each State are to be chosen by a popular delegate State Convention, and those representing the Congressional districts by either separate district conventions, or by subdivisions of the State Convention. The next meeting of the Committee will be held on December 12, when the date of the National Republican Convention will be settled.

Considerable talk has resulted in Washington from the fact that Richard J. Hinton, late proprietor of a newspaper in that city which published the Garfield-Dorsey correspondence, has been appointed a Special Agent of the Treasury Department, and has gone to the Mexican border to investigate a supposed extensive system of smuggling.

An indictment was found on Wednesday, by the Grand Jury of the District of Columbia, against Frank H. Fall, charging him with endeavoring corruptly to control the vote of Juror Brown in the first Star-route trial. Frank E. Shaw was indicted on Friday on a similar charge.

Ex-United States Senator Spencer, who is a fugitive witness of the Star-route trial, has sailed from Halifax for England.

Representative John W. Shackelford, of the Third North Carolina District, died in Washington, on Thursday, at the age of thirty-nine.

The General Term of the Supreme Court of this State has reversed Judge Haight's decision denying peremptory writs of mandamus to compel certain railroad companies to receive and transport freight with all convenient speed. This litigation grew out of the freight-handlers' strike last summer. The Supreme Court grants the motions asked for in each case. This is a point gained for the merchants who brought the suit.

A bill to prohibit the sale of State lands in the Adirondack region, in order to preserve the forests, passed the State Senate at Albany on Tuesday. On Thursday, in executive session, the Senate voted to postpone final action on the Governor's nominations for Railroad Commissioners until January 26, in order that specific charges might be presented against Mr. O'Donnell.

The prohibitory amendment to the Constitution of Iowa, adopted by the popular vote last June, was declared invalid by the State Supreme Court on Thursday, because the record of the House of the Eighteenth Assembly failed to show that it had passed, and the House measure differed from the amendment as passed by the Senate; further, because subsequent action in the Nineteenth Assembly could not correct the carelessness of the Eighteenth Assembly.

Judges Lowell and Nelson, of the United States Circuit Court, granted in Boston, on Friday, the injunction prayed for by Theodore Thomas, which restrains Joseph G. Lennon from performing Gounod's "Redemption" in that city. The order, however, allows of the performance of the trilogy with organ and pianoforte accompaniment, and it will be so given.

The past week has been marked by a series of terrible accidents, which have been unusually destructive of life. On Wednesday the steamer *Josephine* blew up in Port Susan Bay, near Seattle, W. T., killing six or more of the passengers and crew. A panic was caused in the Grand Opera-House, Milwaukee, on Thursday night, during a performance of "The Lights of London," by the explosion of calcium-light apparatus on the stage. Five of the stage hands were hurt, two fatally. Order was soon restored in the audience. The Quincy House, one of the largest hotels in Quincy, Ill., was burned on Friday morning. Many of the guests were still asleep, though some were at breakfast. All escaped, but lost everything. A wreck occurred on the Central Pacific Railroad near Colfax, California, on Friday, and several persons were killed and injured. The latest estimate places the loss of life by the Milwaukee Hotel fire at fifty-nine. Scheller, the bar-keeper, has been arrested, charged with setting fire to the building, and the evidence against him is strong. The brig *Mariposa* was run down by a steamer off Fisher's Island on Saturday, and all but one of the crew were drowned.

The overland express train which left San Francisco by the Southern Pacific Railroad at 9:30 A. M. on Saturday, stopped near Tehichipa station to cut out an extra engine taken on to assist in pulling up the Tehichipa grade. While making the change the train started back northward down a grade of 129 feet to the mile. The train gathered headway quickly, and was soon dashing down the grade at the rate of a mile a minute. At a sharp curve the coach and smoker, which were ahead, broke the coupling and separated from the rest of the train, making the turn safely. The sleepers and the mail, express, and baggage-cars were dashed against a high bank and then thrown back, rolling down an embankment. The lamps and stoves at once set fire to the wreck, which was instantly in a blaze. A search for the dead showed that fourteen persons had perished.

On Sunday afternoon, at 4 o'clock, a number of terrific explosions occurred at the Giant Powder Works, at Point Clement, near San Francisco, destroying the mixing house and six packing houses. Eight tons of powder exploded, killing about thirty Chinese workmen. The assistant superintendent was also killed. All houses within a radius of half a mile were wrecked. The loss by the explosion is about \$100,000. A fierce fire followed, which was with difficulty extinguished. The cause of the explosions is a mystery.

On Monday morning a boiler at the *Ledger* paper mills, near Elkton, Md., exploded, wrecking half of the immense building, killing two men and injuring eight others.

A great snow-storm, followed by very cold weather, prevailed in the West on Friday and Saturday. The cold wave reached the East on Sunday night.

News was received in Washington on Thursday that the Alaskan Indian Aneguin, of the *Jeannette* crew, who was saved with

Melville's party, had died of smallpox in Siberia, with Ensign Hunt's party.

Henry Kip, of Buffalo, Vice-President of the United States Express Company, died in New York on Wednesday.

It is reported that a gift of \$250,000 has been made by the citizens of Cambridge, Mass., to Harvard College, to be disposed of in the erection of new dormitories, in which the rent of each room shall not exceed \$50 a year.

FOREIGN.

After Prince Napoleon's arrest in Paris on January 16 he explained in an interview that he did not aim at personal power, but asserted that he believed a parliamentary régime was only practicable under a constitutional monarchy. In the Chamber of Deputies M. Floquet, Vice-President, immediately brought forward a motion prohibiting the presence in France or Algeria of any members of former French dynasties. Urgency was voted for it by a large majority. The press of Paris ridiculed this motion as extreme. On Saturday the French Ministerial Bill dealing with the pretenders was introduced in the Chamber of Deputies. It authorizes the President of the Republic, by a decree given in Council, to expel members of the former reigning families whose presence in France compromises the safety of the State, those returning to be liable to five years in prison. The princes who now serve in the army are to be placed on the retired list. This last clause caused an uproar in the Chamber. Another bill has been introduced modifying the Press Laws of 1881. It provides for the punishment of outrages against the Republic, and makes the offenders amenable to the Correctional Tribunals. A vote of urgency was also adopted for these measures.

The Paris newspapers of Friday and Saturday published details of an alleged organization of civil war in the west of France, with the help of Catholic workmen's clubs. It was said that a great Legitimist conspiracy called the "Catholic Alliance" had been discovered, forming a vast association, directed by Baron de Charette. Thirty-two legions, of 1,000 men each, had been organized from Finistère to Tours, and six hundred horses had been purchased as a nucleus for insurgent cavalry. It was said that the conspirators had \$3,000,000 in London banks. Some newspapers asserted that this report was circulated in order to push M. Floquet's extreme proposal in the Chamber of Deputies.

The Paris Bourse was subjected to a slight panic on Monday, owing to the revolutionary rumors. On Tuesday, reports were abroad that the Cabinet had resigned. The result of the elections in the bureaux of the Chamber of Deputies on that day for members of the committee on the bills dealing with the pretenders to the throne was four in favor of the Government bills with certain restrictions, six in favor of M. Floquet's bill, and one in favor of M. Ballue's. A Cabinet crisis is imminent.

At the trial of the Anarchists in Lyons, France, on Friday, Prince Krapotkine, MM. Émile Gautier, Bernard, and Bordat were found guilty and sentenced each to five years' imprisonment and to pay \$400 fine, to ten years' police supervision, and to five years' deprivation of civil rights. Thirty-nine others were given lighter sentences, and four were acquitted. The condemned will probably appeal.

Gustave Doré, the famous French painter and designer, died suddenly in Paris on Tuesday, at the age of fifty. It is said that his designs number 45,000.

The Hamburg-American steamship *Cimbria*, while on her way from Hamburg to Havre, was run into, Friday morning, during a dense fog, by the British steamship *Sultan*. The *Cimbria* sank in a few minutes. The disaster occurred in the German ocean, off the Island of Borkum, twenty-six miles north-west of Emden. The *Cimbria* left Ham-

burg on Thursday, with twenty-three cabin passengers, 362 steerage, and a crew numbering ninety-two. She ran aground before leaving the Elbe, but got off with the flood tide, with the assistance of the *Hansa*, without having received damage, and she put to sea at 2:30 o'clock in the afternoon. On Friday morning she came in collision with the steamer *Sultan*. A boat with thirty-nine passengers arrived at Cuxhaven Friday night. Seventeen other persons were saved by the steamer *Diamant*, and another vessel landed eleven. The officers did all in their power to save lives at the time of the collision, but the vessel sank too soon. It is estimated that fully 400 lives were lost. The passengers were mostly emigrants from East Prussia. The *Cimbria* was a vessel of 3,025 tons burden. She had seven water-tight compartments.

The ship *Vorwarts* was sunk on the Baltic on Monday, and eight persons were drowned.

In the German Reichstag the reception of large sums of money from America for the flood sufferers has been announced during the week, and thanks have been enthusiastically voted.

Prince Frederick Charles Alexander, brother of the Emperor of Germany, died in Berlin on Sunday, at the age of eighty-two. The Emperor and Empress partook of the sacrament with him only a half-hour before his death. His last words were, "Long live the Emperor." Prince Charles entered the German Army at an early age, and made the artillery his favorite branch of the service. For many years past he has been chief of the whole Prussian artillery force. His only son is the famous "Red Prince" of the Franco-Prussian war. In 1881 Prince Charles celebrated a jubilee on the occasion of the seventieth anniversary of his appointment as an officer of the Prussian Army.

At a sitting of the Provincial Committee in Strassburg, Germany, on Thursday, 17 Deputies out of 56 protested against the exclusion of the use of the French language in the proceedings of that body.

A Governmental scheme, formulated by the Egyptian Ministry, approved by Lord Dufferin, and transmitted to the British Foreign Office for approval, proposes that the Khedive of Egypt shall have a Council of twelve responsible Ministers, and that a Legislative Council of fourteen members shall be formed, one-half to be nominated by the Khedive and half to be chosen by a system of double election. There is also a provision for an elective Assembly of forty-four members, to be convened occasionally to discuss special subjects. Legislation is to be initiated by the Council of Ministers, but before becoming law it must be submitted to the Legislative Council. The Khedive will decide in case of differences between these two bodies.

A fight has occurred between a body of 500 Egyptian troops and the forces of the False Prophet in the Sudan. Two hundred and forty of the former were killed and the rest were taken prisoners.

The Marquis of Hartington, British Secretary of State for War, in a speech at Bacup, England, on Friday evening, referring to Irish affairs, said that the Irish problem could only be met by firm determination. He did not think the matter was hopeless. The law must be strengthened to meet the exceptional condition of the country. The Government meant to show that murder would meet its just reward. Home Rule, he said, could never be permitted in Ireland. It had been suggested that the Government should find funds to establish peasant proprietary in Ireland, but he strongly condemned the idea of paying out the hard-earned funds in the English exchequer for such a purpose, unless it could be shown that the people were capable and willing to work. Although he could not say that crime had been eradicated, there were clearly good results from the exceptional legislation in regard to Ireland.

The twenty-one persons recently arrested in Dublin, charged with conspiracy to murder of officials, were before the police court in that city on Saturday. Startling revelations were made by an informer named Farrell. He swore that several of the prisoners, including Mr. Carey, a member of the municipality, were present at a Fenian meeting where the informer was asked to join the inner circle formed for the assassination of officers. He acknowledged having taken part in a plot to assassinate a juror. He swore that one of the prisoners, named Hanlon, informed him that he had taken part in the attempt to murder Field; that Brady stabbed Field, and that Kelly also participated in the affair. Farrell also testified that the city had been marked into districts, and military inspections were held occasionally, at which most of the accused men were present. The organization, he said, had existed for several years. Farrell said picked men formed an assassination committee. They were ignorant of each other. Daniel Curley gave him (Farrell) a revolver, and told him to stop Mr. Forster's carriage opposite Ellis Quay, when Jim Kelly and Joe Brady would do the remainder. The plot failed through a mistake. On the day of the Phoenix Park murders, the witness met Brady in a public house in Georges Street, with McCaffrey. Brady asked the witness when he would be done with his work. He said at 7 o'clock. Brady said that that would be too late. On being cross-examined, witness said that no order for assassination was ever received from the Fenian Society. The orders used to be given from the Assassination Society. The prisoners were all remanded for one week. The appearance of three of them exactly corresponds with the description of the three murderers of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke.

Mr. Michael Davitt appeared on Thursday before the Queen's Bench Division in Dublin to defend himself against the charge of inciting to lawlessness in a recent speech at Navan. He urged that the principles which he advocated did not interfere with the administration or the observance of the law. Mr. Healy made a similar defence. The court reserved its decision.

Mr. Gladstone, with several members of his family, went to France on Wednesday for recuperation.

Mr. George Darwin, son of the late Charles Darwin, has been elected Professor of Astronomy and Experimental Philosophy in Cambridge University, England.

A great strike is in progress among the workmen of the Caledonia Railway in Scotland.

The largest gasometer in Glasgow, Scotland, exploded on Saturday night. Eight persons were injured. A shed belonging to the Caledonian Railway Company was also blown up. Fenians are supposed to have originated the explosions.

Three terrible explosions of gunpowder in the town of Muiden, Holland, on Friday, unroofed nearly all the houses there, and damaged neighboring towns and villages. About a score of lives were lost.

A great part of the city of Kherson, in South Russia, was burned on January 16.

A great landslide occurred on Thursday, in the valley of Faverges, Switzerland, destroying the village of Marais. The inhabitants were able to escape.

There have been numerous destructive earthquake shocks in Murcia, Spain, recently.

A bloody battle took place near Tehuantepec, Mexico, the latter part of last week, between the Tehuantepec Indians and the Seventh Battalion of Mexican troops. Fifty of the latter and eighty of the former were killed and many wounded. The Indians were defeated.

Cetewayo, the Zulu chief, has been enthusiastically received in South Africa on his way to Ulundi.

THE FORCE BILL IN THE SUPREME COURT.

THE section of the Revised Statutes which the Supreme Court on Monday decided to be unconstitutional (U. S. R. S. 5519) is a part of the Ku-Klux Act of 1871. It reads thus:

"If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire, or go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws, or for the purpose of preventing or hindering the constituted authorities of any State or Territory from giving or securing to all persons within such State or Territory the equal protection of the laws, each of such persons shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or by imprisonment, with or without hard labor, not less than six months nor more than six years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

The act was passed by Congress for the purpose of protecting the negroes and loyal whites in the South from a secret, oath-bound society of white men, organized for the purpose of committing outrages. As a sample of the appeals for aid from the South at the time, which led to this legislation, the Governor of North Carolina, Mr. Holden, wrote to the President in 1870 as follows: "There exists in this State a secret, oath-bound, armed organization, which is hostile to the State government and to the Government of the United States. Bands of these armed men ride at night through various neighborhoods, whipping and maltreating peaceable citizens, hanging some," etc., etc. "These outrages are almost invariably committed on persons, white and colored, who are most devoted in their feelings and conduct to the Government of the United States." Next year what was supposed to be permanent legal provision was made for such cases. The act was very long and elaborate; it contained, besides the section quoted above, numerous others, designed to prevent interference with United States process, and with the exercise of the Federal franchise, and the performance of their duties by Federal officials. These provisions must not be confounded with Section 5519; many of them are probably open to no constitutional objection, certainly not to the objections which have proved fatal to this one. The military features of the act were those which attracted most attention at the time, but they are not involved in the present case.

We ventured to urge in these columns, at the time of the passage of the bill, that the general method of legislating against "conspiracies" in it was unconstitutional, and even involved an idea subversive of our very system of government. The bill provides, we said (*Nation*, April 20, 1871),

"under many artful involutions of language, that conspiracies and combinations for the purpose of depriving persons of their rights and privileges, or of the equal protection of the laws, shall be crime against the United States, punishable by its tribunals";

involving the monstrous conclusion that

"the ordinary crimes of violence committed throughout the States . . . are justiciable in the national tribunals. The extreme care with which the word conspiracy is everywhere used does not change this result. A conspiracy is in no way essentially different from an offence done by one or by many, without concert. . . . There is no legal magic in the word conspiracy, no power to confer jurisdiction, and no strength is added to the statute by its use. If valid now, it would have been

equally valid had its penalties been applied in terms to acts of violence done by single persons."

With regard to the idea that such legislation could derive any validity from the Fourteenth Amendment, forbidding any State to "make or enforce any law" abridging the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, or to "deny to any person" the "equal protection of the laws," we said that this prohibition was on its face directed against State action, and that if every private crime committed in a State involved a denial to the person injured of the protection of the laws, then the amendment gave the United States courts jurisdiction in the case of every murder, theft, burglary, libel, and assault and battery throughout the Union. Either this, or the act was so far mere waste paper. For this "disloyal" view of the subject, we were severely criticised at the time by those who, like the late Mr. Sumner, thought that what the country wanted was "the Centralism of Liberty" and the "Imperialism of Equal Rights;" nevertheless, the view we advanced is precisely that now laid down by the Supreme Court.

The facts in the Harris case, which brought the clause in question before the Supreme Court, were these. Some time in 1877 a Tennessee deputy sheriff, named Tucker, arrested four men (whether white or black does not appear in the record) to answer certain criminal charges not set forth. While in custody of this State officer, the four men were attacked by an armed body, of whom the defendant Harris was one, and so beaten and maltreated that one of them died. The Grand Jury indicted the assailants under Section 5519, and the defendants demurred to the indictment, or, in other words, admitted the facts charged, but denied that they could be punished, on the ground that the Constitution did not give Congress jurisdiction over the offence.

The Supreme Court does not seem to have had much difficulty in deciding that the section is utterly invalid. The authority for it must be found, the Court says—and none of its advocates ever claimed anything more than this—either in the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, or Fifteenth Amendments. Now, the Thirteenth Amendment merely abolishes slavery, and the Fifteenth forbids denial of the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. It is impossible to see how these provisions confer upon Congress the right to punish for violence upon the highway, or a conspiracy to commit such violence. As to the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment—"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws"—the Court says:

"The section in controversy cannot be based on the Fourteenth Amendment, since that has reference to State action exclusively and not to any action of private individuals. The language of the amendment does not leave this subject in doubt. When the State has been guilty of no violation of its provisions, when it has not made or enforced any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, when no one of its departments has deprived any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or denied to any person within its

jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws; when, on the contrary, the laws of the State as enacted by its legislative, construed by its judicial, and administered by its executive departments, recognize and protect the rights of all persons, the amendment imposes no duty and confers no power upon Congress."

In the indictment in this case, the Court continues, there is no intimation that the State of Tennessee, by act of its legislative or judicial divisions, or through its Executive, has done anything in contravention of the Fourteenth Amendment. On the contrary, the acts on which it is based are crimes of private individuals. These are within the ordinary criminal jurisdiction of the State, which is not transferred to the United States by the Fourteenth or any other amendment.

The decision settles the point forever that the Fourteenth Amendment merely adds new limitations upon State action to those already existing in the Constitution (*e. g.*, the clause forbidding States to impair the obligation of contracts), and does not change in any way the fundamental structure of the Government.

ENFORCEMENT OF STATE DEBTS.

MR. MOORE, of Tennessee, proposes to introduce at an early day in the House a constitutional amendment, repealing the existing Eleventh Amendment, and giving the creditors of a State the right to sue it in the State courts. This has doubtless been suggested to him by the recent scandalous proceedings in his own State, and the enormous defaults made by counties, cities, and towns all over the West. In 1879 thirty counties in Missouri, besides many towns and cities, were in default. Kansas had somewhat the same story to tell. Judgments were obtained against some of them, but we suspect very little money was ever recovered from them by process of law, so difficult is it to force a whole community to be honest. In most cases the creditors compromised, or let their claims lie, to avoid fresh vexation and expense. Daniel Webster was consulted over forty years ago as to the power of American States to contract loans, and their obligation to repay them, and he gave a very emphatic opinion to the effect that they were abundantly competent to borrow, and were bound in honor to repay; but only in honor. He evidently did not think that they were exposed to any compulsory process.

The Eleventh Amendment was undoubtedly intended to protect them against this process on the part of individuals. Recently, under the influence of the scandalous conduct of some of the States, the question has been raised whether the claims of an individual against a State cannot be assigned to his own State, and whether it cannot then sue on them. The experiment is now being tried by the State of New York, which has accepted an assignment of individual claims against the State of Louisiana, and has authorized the Attorney-General to sue on them. The case is before the Supreme Court, which has heard the argument and will probably soon give judgment. Should it decide that it has jurisdiction of the controversy, and can issue execution against a State on a debt, we shall, however, have reached the most interesting stage of the proceedings, and the one which has received least consideration. How would the court execute a judgment against a State, supposing

there was no money in the Treasury which could be seized? It could not compel an unwilling Legislature to levy a tax for the purpose of satisfying a judgment. A Legislature cannot be constrained by any process. It may be dispersed or disregarded, but not coerced, as the officers of a defaulting county or city can be.

It is said that the courts could, in case of need, themselves appoint officers to levy a tax on a delinquent and recalcitrant county. But would it go so far as to undertake through its officers the taxation of an entire State, and would the Army and Navy be employed to support them in levying on a hostile population? This would, of course, be tantamount to taking military possession of the State during the period necessary to satisfy the judgment, and would be an undertaking of great difficulty and delicacy. The theory on which this power is claimed for the general Government is that on entering into the Union the States gave up the right of making war on their own account, and therefore the Union is bound to do for them by law whatever they could themselves have done by armed force, in asserting claims or redressing wrongs. On the other hand, the right or expediency of going to war to enforce payment of money lent to a state by private citizens is now repudiated by all modern states, and has not been resorted to in any recent case against an independent power. War on behalf of money-lenders is justly regarded with increasing horror.

There is another consideration in this matter, of considerable weight, which is not to be overlooked. An undertaking on the part of the National Government to satisfy judgments for debt issued from its courts against States would really be equivalent to a Federal guarantee of all State liabilities. It would, in other words, constitute itself an agent for the collection of all State debts, and an agent, too, who could not afford to fail in his self-imposed duty. The guarantee would cover the debts contracted by State Legislatures over whose doings the Federal Government has neither control nor supervision.

That this would enormously improve State credit is obvious; but is it desirable to improve State credit by any agencies except the growth of the State population in industry, order, legality, and integrity? Would it be well to announce to money-lenders all over the world that in lending money to an American State hereafter they need not consider the character of the men who rule it, or its financial history, or the habits of its people, or its natural resources; that the National Government would see them paid, no matter what the State Government was?

All these are matters to be weighed in attempting any legislation on this subject. The problem is not one by any means to be disposed of by the adoption of a constitutional amendment giving the Supreme Court jurisdiction of State debts. Such an amendment would have to be followed by legislation making full and minute provision for executing the process of the court.

Such contingencies as the refusal of State Legislatures to levy a tax in obedience to the judgment would have to be provided for in

minutest detail, because in such cases the Legislature would probably be supported by the people. The general Government would then have on its hands the very serious task of levying a tax on a hostile population—a task to which hardly any government in the world has ever found itself equal, and for which the American Government is less fitted than most others. It has to be borne in mind that thus far in our history the general Government has never undertaken to coerce a State as such. It has put down rebellion among the people of a State, and has treated the State Government as abolished or destroyed by the fact of such rebellion, and it has withheld certain rights or privileges from States—such as admission to the Union, or full representation—until it complied with certain prescribed conditions. But it has never said to a State, in good and regular standing within the Union, that its Legislature must pass a certain act or appropriation, on pain of deposition or military execution. In attempting such coercion on behalf of State creditors, therefore, we should be attempting a wholly new thing, and one which would radically change the relations of the States to the Federal Government. Hitherto the Federal Government has acted on persons in its administration and legislation, and kept the States within constitutional limits by nullifying such of their laws as infringed the Constitution. If the Union took charge of their debts, it would enter on a new path, and undertake to prescribe to them not simply what they should not do, but what they should do.

THE LEGITIMIST REVIVAL.

THERE has been no odder piece of news from France since Sedan than the discovery of a plan of armed insurrection on the part of the Legitimists, by organizing "thirty-two legions of 1,000 men each," with a cavalry "nucleus" of 600 horses (the troopers, apparently, not being yet ready), and \$3,000,000 in bank in London as sinews of war. It is almost more ridiculous than the Duchesse de Berri's rising in La Vendée in 1832, which ended in her concealing herself from the gendarmes in a chimney. After that period the Legitimists of the extreme divine-right school may be said to have wholly disappeared from politics until 1870. They lived in their country houses and farmed, made little pilgrimages to Germany to pay their respects to the Comte de Chambord on his birthday, and heard the Mass of the Holy Ghost in little chapels on the anniversary of Louis Sixteenth's death. Those who were rich enough passed the winter in Paris in a social coterie which neither foreigners nor Republicans ever entered, and in which even Orleanists were ill at ease, or else came up for a few weeks to little hôtels on the left bank of the Seine, in which the landlord was pious and "the King" was talked of familiarly at the table d'hôte. A few, but very few—one of the Larochejacqueleins was among them—gave in their adhesion to the Empire and took service under it, but they suffered for it socially. Many enlisted in the curious body called "the Pontifical Zouaves," and served as the Pope's contribu-

tion to the garrison of Rome during the French occupation, and were supposed, on account of their piety, to be worth three times the number of wicked Frenchmen or Italians. At one time they had the famous Lamoricière at their head, and under him actually tried to stop the entrance of the Piedmontese into the States of the Church, in 1859, by the use of carnal weapons, but were badly beaten at Castelfidardo, and had to break up and go home, the Pope being after this unable to support them.

For the next ten years the Legitimist world was a very dull world. There was nothing going on in it. After Sedan, however, there came what appeared to be the dawning of a new day. The French Army was almost annihilated, and all men in office were thoroughly discredited and disheartened. When the Assembly was elected which was to make peace, and erect a new framework of government on the bloody ruins with which France was covered, the voters, for want of anything better, dug out all the Legitimist country gentlemen they could lay hands on, most of whom had never been heard of in politics by any of the existing generation, and were probably amazed by the call on them, and sent them to the Assembly. This apparently gave the legitimate monarchy a chance of restoration which no man in France ever expected to see again. The majority, led by dukes and marquises, were satisfied that their first duty was to bring back the King. When they found M. Thiers opposed to it they got rid of him, and put Marshal MacMahon in his place. At this juncture they might possibly have brought Henry V. back and proclaimed him if he had been the right sort of man. They are said to have had the carriages prepared for the royal entry to Paris, and the acquiescence of the military chiefs was certain, and judges and functionaries would have been willing enough, when the King's obstinacy ruined the whole scheme. He resolutely refused to hoist the tricolor, and his most ardent supporters confessed sorrowfully that he could not come back to France under the white flag. So they had to postpone everything to that unknown period when, to use their own phrase, "God's hour will strike."

Since then they have been gradually expelled from both houses of the Legislature, until they have only a small minority. They have also been, to a very large extent, removed or have retired from the judicial and administrative offices which they managed to get hold of during the five or six years following the fall of the Empire. They lately tried to gratify their newly-acquired taste for movement and activity, and procure the means of power in the modern world which they so much despise, by stock speculation, and for this purpose got up the Union Générale, with the Pope's blessing as part of the capital. The disastrous result is well known. Its managers have gone to jail, or are to go if they can be caught, and many owners of the finest names in France have had to undergo the humiliation of not being able to pay their "differences," just like any unlucky American speculator, who never goes to church, and lets his daughters run about alone. Probably the horrible quiet which followed

on the "Krach" of last year has proved a hell to the quick bosoms of the party, and they have begun their little military preparations as a sort of distraction, and doubtless with that belief which ardent desire so often generates, that everything is on their side—that the Army is ready to join them, and that the people are tired of the godless Republic. They will hardly be undeceived within the present century. There is nothing more enduring in the land of dreams than the fanaticism of loyalty, especially when, as in the case of the French Legitimists, the cause of the King and that of the Church seem so closely united by all the circumstances of the age.

INTELLECT AND EDUCATION IN ENGLISH POLITICS.

LONDON, Dec. 30, 1882.

AN amusing little controversy arose here not long ago as to which it is of our two great political parties that can claim a superiority in intelligence and education. Formerly the Tories were deemed to be the stupid party—the phrase is attributed to Mr. J. S. Mill—and did not much object to the description, because rank and wealth used to have in England a way of looking down on intellect as plebeian, so that to be great without being intellectual meant that one was possessed of other and more respectable elements of power. But Lord Carnarvon, who is honorably distinguished among the nobility by having not only a really old and dignified lineage (a very rare thing in the upstart peerage of England), but by his scholarship and general mental culture, lately claimed for the Tory party that it included three-fourths of the men who are intellectually eminent, and whose opinions on politics are therefore presumably better than those of the crowd. Some Liberal who was stung by this, wrote to the newspapers, giving a list of men of letters and science whom he asserted to be Liberals; and our journals discussed the point for a while, of course with no result, for many of the persons cited as Liberals were not really so, and in a matter of this kind the mere accumulation of well-known names goes for very little: it is the amount of a man's intellect and the extent to which his attention has been given to politics that make his opinion valuable, and entitle it to outweigh that of ordinary people.

However, just when the controversy was dying away, it was revived by another event. One of the seats in Parliament for the University of Cambridge became vacant by the retirement of Mr. Walpole, and the contest which took place for the vacancy excited some attention, because a University seat is regarded as a specially honorable one, reserved for politicians of distinction. For this seat the Tories put forward Mr. Cecil Raikes, a politician of some experience, who was, under the Government of Beaconsfield, Chairman of Committees in the House of Commons, and so enjoys a good standing in that assembly as an authority on matters of procedure. He was already member for Preston, but resigned the representation of that town in order to win the more dignified place. He is only a moderately good speaker, and not a man of any particular cultivation, without any claims to eminence either in literature or science, and no special knowledge of educational questions. The Liberal candidate run against him was Mr. James Stuart, Fellow of Trinity College, and Professor of Applied Mechanics in the University—a man who had distinguished himself by his ardor and skill in teaching, and still more, perhaps, by his exertions in founding

systems of local lectures by University graduates in the great towns of the middle and north of England. He had never taken any part in politics, and so far might be thought to stand at a disadvantage, but as respects what are called "academical qualifications," he was much superior to his rival, who had no more aptitude for representing a university than any other Conservative member. However, when the voting took place, Mr. Raikes was returned by an enormous majority, having received more than 3,000 votes, as against Mr. Stuart's 1,300. This result was welcomed by the Tory organs as another evidence that educated men were on their side, while the Liberals endeavored to explain it away as they best might. It surprised no one who has attended to such matters, for in both Oxford and Cambridge the large majority of graduates are clergymen of the Church of England, nearly all of whom are Conservatives, and it was ridiculous to expect that people would vote for a candidate who represented opinions they condemn merely because he was eminent as a teacher of science. The teachers resident at Cambridge, the professors of the University, and tutors of the colleges, were no doubt mostly on Mr. Stuart's side, but they are a drop in the bucket (not over three hundred) compared with the whole constituency. In Oxford the victory of a Tory candidate would have been at least as complete; in the universities of Scotland, Liberal as Scotland is, the Tories secured one of the two seats by a large majority at the last general election, and were defeated by a very small majority only in the contest for the other. In Ireland the Conservatives always hold the two University seats. There is not the slightest doubt that, if all the graduates in the United Kingdom were polled, the number of Tories would prove to be at least double that of Liberals. So far, then, education is on the Tory side. Nor would the result be different if the great professions were to be taken. The medical practitioners are more frequently Conservatives than Liberals. The bar is still more decidedly Conservative.

How is this phenomenon to be explained, and what significance or weight does it possess? How far may it fairly be allowed to tell in favor of Conservatism as a policy? Does it justify Lord Carnarvon's statement that intellect is on the Tory side?

It is due partly to the accidental association of the practice of college graduates with certain classes in the community, and in so far has little or no political consequence; partly to a certain state of mind and temper among educated people generally in England, which is really significant, and therefore worth examining. The English universities are, more conspicuously than the universities of any other country, institutions for the education of the upper classes. Of the sixteen or seventeen hundred youths who annually graduate at Oxford and Cambridge, the large majority either belong to what would be called the wealthier classes, the landed gentry, the great merchants and manufacturers, the successful professional men, or else become clergymen of the Church of England. Now, both the clergy of the Church of England and the wealthier classes—more especially, of course, the landowning gentry—belong to the Conservative party. The Nonconformists, who are nearly all Liberals, are only beginning to acquire the habit of resorting to Oxford and Cambridge, from which, till eleven years ago, they were practically excluded. Thus the graduates are naturally Conservatives, not because they are graduates, but because they belong to sections of the population which are Conservative. Their University education, it may certainly be urged, does not break through and overpower the ten-

dency to Conservative opinions which they derive from their birth, their profession (if clergymen), and the sentiment of those they associate with. But neither can it fairly be said that it is this University education which makes them Conservatives, for the other causes are quite sufficient to account for that fact.

However, the question has really very little interest so far as it relates to University graduates, because they are not necessarily a highly-educated class. More than half, probably quite two-thirds, of our youth leave Oxford and Cambridge without having received any considerable intellectual impulse. They are in so far the better for having been there that they have lived in a society larger and more varied than they could otherwise have seen, and have formed agreeable, and even improving, friendships. But they may get their degree without having gained much knowledge or training, and may be no better fitted to form a political opinion than any sensible man who reads the newspapers. A little classics and mathematics does not go far toward political insight. It is more important to inquire why many men of real intellectual power or extended knowledge, who would probably have been Liberals forty or fifty years ago, are Conservatives now. It used to be the presumption that our eminent literary or scientific man was a Liberal; this presumption does not now exist. Perhaps it is even a little the other way, if one may reckon as Conservatives those who, while calling themselves Whigs, are really opposed to Mr. Gladstone and the policy he represents. Liberalism used to be far stronger than Toryism in our press; now it is not stronger in London, though no doubt still stronger in the provinces, where nearly all the best-written papers are Gladstonite. The great historians of the last generation, Hallam, Macaulay, Milman, Grote, were all Liberals. Now some of our best historical names, such as those of Stubbs and Gardiner and Merivale, cannot be classed on that side. It is the same with the poets, with the philosophers (so far as we have any), with the men of science. The disposition among men of superior powers used to be to advocate and welcome political changes; now it is quite as much a disposition to fear and deprecate them, preferring the arrangements under which society actually works.

The reason of this may be found in the difference between the condition of England now and its condition fifty years ago. Then a great number of abuses existed which had to be swept away, which obviously interfered with the freedom and happiness of the individual, and which could not be justified upon principle. Nothing could be said for them except that they existed and maintained the power of the then governing class. Against these abuses men of active and penetrating minds naturally rebelled. They ranged themselves on the side of reason against prejudice, of progress against stagnation. They were successful. These abuses were swept away; the most crying faults of our social and economical system were cured, the greatest gaps in our administration filled up by the creation of new departments, such as the Education Department. Considerable changes were made in the distribution of political power which satisfied that sympathy with the claims of the masses which possessed so many of our best minds. The best illustration of the then dominant tendency of intellectual opinion is furnished by the free-trade controversy. The advantages of free trade for England were argued by Richard Cobden and his coadjutors as a matter of economic science. They were opposed partly by mere ignorance and dulness, partly by appeals to the supposed material interests of the agricultural class. Hence men of intelligence, men who

could understand scientific reasonings and felt that they ought to prevail, naturally took the side of free trade, and became hostile to the Tory and protectionist party because it was the party of obscurantism. The same thing happened, though less conspicuously, in the struggle over elementary education against the pretensions of the Church of England clergy, and in the contest for opening the universities to Non-conformists. Here, also, the Tory party was the ecclesiastical party, and might be branded as the party of obscurantism and exclusion, while the Liberals fought for the extension of education, the admission of all classes and sects equally to its benefits, the dethronement of the clergy and clericalism. All these controversies are now practically over. The principles of free trade, despite the attempts lately made to set up an agitation for reciprocity—attempts which failed before they had taken any hold on the nation—are accepted by Conservative as well as by Liberal statesmen, and are no longer, so to speak, part of the peculiar stock-in-trade of the Liberal party. Clericalism has been defeated all along the line; elementary education is unsectarian, and so are the universities. Here, therefore, also the Liberals have lost their old advantage. The questions which now divide the two parties are not questions on which it can be said that lovers of light ought to array themselves on one side, and lovers of darkness on the other. A man who is eager, hopeful, filled with sympathy for the humbler classes, persuaded that their impulses will be generally toward what is good, and that they may therefore be trusted with more power than they yet possess, will enlist on the Liberal side. A man who is cautious, cool-headed, averse to sentimental arguments, penetrated by a feeling of the difficulties which attend the working of democratic institutions, will tend toward Conservatism. So, too, will he who is well satisfied with things as they are, and, while admitting that they might be improved, conceives that as the crying grievances of the working-class and of the Irish have been redressed, the time has come to pause. Now, a person of intellectual power and culture may just as well belong to either of these latter classes as to the former; and the differences of nature which dispose men to be Conservatives or Liberals are rather differences of temperament and of sympathy than of mere intelligence. It is for this reason that Mr. Gladstone's wonderful intellectual gifts do not gain him so much support from literary or scientific men as the sentimental or emotional quality of his character excites distrust from those men of culture who pique themselves on trying everything by the dry light of reason.

Perhaps one may carry this line of observation a step further. There is a tendency among philosophers and historians to be always in opposition to the prevailing political tendencies of their time, just because they are the keenest to perceive the faults and dangers of those tendencies. Plato and Thucydides were the most acute critics of the Athenian democracy, while the great thinkers and poets who have lived under despotic governments have usually been apostles of freedom. Since 1832, the popular party has been generally in the ascendant in Great Britain, and seems to many to be on the eve of attempting large constitutional changes. It is natural, therefore, and not only natural, but wholesome, that there should be an active literary opposition to the democratic movement of our time; and that opposition would doubtless be far stronger were it not that the Conservatism of the upper classes, which often finds expression in an arrogant and selfish assertion of their own interests, repels some of the literary and philosophic talent of the time, and drives it into the

Liberal camp. This, however, is exceptional. On the whole, the influence of the richer classes tells strongly for Conservatism among the men of education and culture. If there were any exciting issues before the country, such men would take sides according to their views of what reason and history taught; but in a time like the present, when the issues are not exciting, and when reason and history cannot be claimed for either side exclusively, mere social influences count for a great deal, and draw into the Tory ranks many persons who do not by extraction or wealth belong to the upper class. We shall soon have an opportunity of judging what the literary fighting power of the Tory party is, for some of its leaders—prominent among whom is Lord Carnarvon—announce that they are establishing a new review or magazine for the express and sole purpose of advocating Conservative principles. Though it is to deal not only with politics, but also with literary and artistic topics—with religion, philosophy, history, manners, agriculture—all these subjects are to be dealt with in a strictly Conservative spirit and exclusively, it would seem, by Conservative writers. This is a new departure in our magazine journalism, and excites much curiosity. Its promoters say that there is a great deal of "dormant talent" in the Conservative ranks which they desire to evoke, and that Radicalism has hitherto been allowed to have too much of its own way in the magazines. But it need hardly be said that the whole thing is a question of money. No Conservative talent need have lain dormant a day longer than it pleased, because our editors want good writing only, and do not care on which side it is employed: they have no political aims, and if they insert more Liberal than Conservative articles, it can only be either because more are sent to them or because they are better written.

Y.

THE "SALVATION ARMY" AS AN INDEX OF ENGLISH OPINION.

LONDON, December 28, 1882.

My purpose in this letter is not to praise, to blame, or even to criticise the movement of which the Salvation Army is the embodiment, but simply to call the attention of your readers to the curious light thrown both by the movement itself, and still more by the attitude of the English people toward it, upon the condition of belief, opinion, or sentiment in England.

The very existence, in the first place, and still more the extraordinary success, of the Salvation Army throw doubt on the truth of the view often expressed and still oftener entertained, that the present age is, in England at least, an era of unbounded scepticism and of very prevalent religious incredulity. If, indeed, a reader confines his attention (as most of us do) to the books and periodicals which have the greatest vogue among the well-to-do portion of the community, and assumes that such writers as Matthew Arnold, as the author of 'Supernatural Religion,' as the Rev. Stopford Brooke, or even Professor Seeley, or that such writings as the *Fortnightly Review*, the *Nineteenth Century*, or the *Pall Mall Gazette* represent the ordinary beliefs or disbeliefs of the British public, he may fairly enough conclude that what is technically called religious faith is undermined throughout the whole country. Whether such an inference could rightly be drawn even as regards the convictions of the classes to whom the writers or periodicals I have mentioned mainly appeal, is, in my judgment, a very doubtful question. No one is less prone than I am to underrate the importance of that general disintegration of beliefs which, being a result of the unparalleled free-

dom of discussion that has existed in England for more than a generation, is the most striking and impressive phenomenon of the day; but it is, I am convinced, an error to identify a condition of feeling which affects all forms of belief, whether political, historical, or social, with religious scepticism, which, if it exists, is simply one specimen of the break up of dogmatic systems.

Still, if any one maintains that among wealthy Englishmen there exists an amount of avowed theological scepticism such as has not existed, or at any rate been apparent, in any other age, he will find many arguments to urge in favor of his opinion. What I am concerned to notice is, that assertions as to the religious scepticism of the present age must, if they are to correspond with facts, be restricted to particular classes of Englishmen. The Salvation Army is a perfectly natural outgrowth of the condition of English society; it is a plant born of the soil—it is not an exotic, it has not been fostered into growth by any artificial culture. General Booth and his friends have appealed, and have appealed with great success, to the ordinary beliefs of orthodox English Protestants. The very basis on which the existence of the Army rests is the enthusiastic conviction of General, officers, and soldiers that the dogmas of Christianity, as understood by English Protestants, are true. The success of the campaign on which the Army has entered depends in great measure on the fact that thousands of men and women, whose lives fall far short of the Christian or any other standard of duty, are in their hearts convinced that the dogmas of Christianity are true, and can, therefore, by strenuous and sincere appeals to their consciences, be roused, for a time at least, to the attempt of acting up to their own convictions. How would it be possible to collect an army for the object of preaching salvation through Christ among men having no belief in Christianity; or to terrify with fears of eternal punishment listeners who had ceased to believe in the existence of hell? Secularism, I shall be told, prevails among the artisans; the influence of Mr. Bradlaugh must be balanced against the authority of General Booth. The train of thought thus suggested undoubtedly deserves consideration. Mr. Bradlaugh, General Booth, and Cardinal Manning are each signs of the times. The characteristic of the age is that all forms of belief or disbelief grow up and flourish side by side. This, however, does not affect the fact, which is beyond dispute, that the power with the public of General Booth is infinitely greater than that of any secularist in the country. In any contested election, the active friendship of the General would be of infinite value to a candidate. Few were the would-be M.P.'s who, in 1880, would not have been glad to have in their pockets a letter of recommendation from Mr. Spurgeon. The friendship of Mr. Bradlaugh might possibly (though this is very doubtful) benefit a candidate who wished to represent Northampton; in any other borough throughout England Mr. Bradlaugh's patronage would be fatal to the success of even a popular candidate. Few are the men who, when trying to get into Parliament, would boast of being supported by the *National Reformer*.

The success and influence of the Salvation Army is, it should be noted, no isolated phenomenon. If the artisans of England are deeply imbued with secularism or agnosticism, it is very strange that the borough elections should in hundreds of cases be practically decided by the Nonconformists. Neither Dissenting ministers nor the congregations who hear and support them are supposed to be free-thinkers. When Mr. John Morley, to the great regret of all readers who value manly honesty of

thought and outspoken vigor of expression, recently retired from the editorship of the *Fortnightly Review*, he expressed in his farewell address a doubt whether scepticism or free thought (I do not profess to quote his words) had made great progress in England. It were hardly possible to call a more competent or unbiassed witness to the truth of the observation which I press upon your readers—namely, that the existence of the Salvation Army, combined with other circumstances, is hardly consistent with the belief that religious incredulity is in any sense a characteristic of the majority of the English people. We may probably go a good deal further than this, and infer with justice that the English are still, as a body, not only sincere Christians, but also strict Protestants. For the last forty years Romanists, Puseyites, Ritualists, Anglicans of every form and color, have attacked English Protestantism on every side on which it is, or is supposed to be, assailable. The assailants have had in the Church of England a fortress or vantage-ground from which to attack all forms of thorough-going Protestantism. Among certain classes, at any rate, the cause which, for want of a better term, one may call the cause of Sacerdotal Christianity, has made progress. But the sudden rise of a religious movement like that of the Salvation Army, led by laymen, and grounded apparently on the ideas which have always been the basis of Puritan Low Church, Evangelical, or (speaking generally) Protestant forms of Christianity in England, suggests the idea, confirmed by many other facts, that neither Roman Catholicism nor any form of Anglicanism exerts, or is likely to exert, permanent influence over the great body of the English people. Cardinal Manning is a popular representative of Romanism. He is liked, respected, and admired by a large number of wealthy and educated Englishmen, and Englishmen who are not, and are not likely to be, carried over to Rome. But if you tested his influence by the rough-and-ready criterion by which I have tested the influence of Mr. Bradlaugh, you would probably find that the Cardinal had hardly more weight with ordinary Englishmen than has the secularist lecturer. If it were not for the Irish vote, no candidate for an English constituency would care to come before the electors as the friend or follower of Cardinal Manning.

The criticism, in the second place, passed by liberal-minded writers on the proceedings of the Salvation Army exhibits in a marked way one of the most singular and least satisfactory features in the moral and intellectual attitude of educated Englishmen. The one point which these critics have not in general cared to deal with is the truth or falsehood of the theological doctrines preached by General Booth and his officers. Much candor has been shown in appreciating the good side of the General's efforts. Much has been said, both with candor and with truth, of the objection to vulgarizing religious worship and of attempting to arouse attention at the cost of impairing the sentiment of reverence. What appears at any rate odd, or rather would have appeared odd at any other period of English history, is that persons, some of whom cannot be supposed to agree in the fundamental dogmas on which the religious teaching of the Salvationists depends, write as though the zeal and good intentions of the Army and its leaders dispensed a sympathetic critic from the necessity of saying, or perhaps even of making up his own mind, whether the doctrines preached by the Salvationists, or the facts, or alleged facts, on which these doctrines ultimately depend, were true or false. It will and may be urged that the practical admonitions addressed by General Booth to crowds sunk in lives of sin

and misery are of value, and may command our sympathy and respect even though we are not able to believe the dogmas which give force to his preaching. The same argument would, it should be noted, justify a sympathetic criticism of the pilgrimages to Lourdes on the part of critics who, like myself, believe the visionary young woman at Lourdes to have supported a false doctrine by statements which, if not delusions, were as knowingly false as any of the hundred lies told by the Claimant. The train of reasoning or feeling, in short, which justifies sympathetic criticism of religious doctrines in which you do not yourself believe, rests at bottom on the idea, to which modern writers occasionally give definite expression, that, in matters of religion, edification is of far greater consequence than truth.

The conduct, in the last place, of the public, and I fear I must add of the Government, in respect of the attacks made by roughs on the Salvationists, betrays singular indifference to the duty of insuring to all citizens the free exercise of their legal rights. On this matter facts speak for themselves. General Booth and his followers are not, it should be noted, by any means unpopular, either with the well-to-do and so-called respectable classes, or, as far as appears, with the great mass of the people. There are, however, to be found in every large town numbers of roughs who, particularly when instigated by the publicans, are willing enough to break up by force meetings which, though perfectly legal, are offensive to the tastes or prejudices of the kind of persons who form "skeleton armies." There are, in short, in every part of the country, lots of ruffians prepared to deal with General Booth much as Mr. Dempster and his friends tried to deal with Mr. Trian. One would have supposed that the violence of a disreputable mob bent on interfering with the right of public meeting would have aroused the indignation of respectable men of all classes. The general feeling of the public seems, however, to have been one of apathy. The Salvation Army and the Skeleton Army, the Saints and the Roughs, ought to be allowed to battle their quarrel out together: in any case, persons who sympathize with neither force ought not, according to the prevailing view, to be disturbed. If the blackguards of Little Pedlington objected to the hymns and sermons of General Booth, and threatened to dissolve the General's prayer-meetings by force, then the General and his friends, it was argued, were causing a breach of the peace, and the duty of respectable magistrates was to hinder a meeting which, though perfectly legal, was likely to excite the anger of ruffians and to prompt the said ruffians to break the law. To put the matter in the plainest terms, the popular view (which was to a certain extent countenanced by the Government) is that assemblies otherwise perfectly legal become unlawful if they are held in places where they are likely to offend the feeling of the populace. The law courts have happily corrected the monstrous delusion that the exercise of their legal rights by peaceable citizens could be limited or hindered according to the will or the caprice of a lawless mob. The judges have performed their duty, and have done the best they could to impress upon the nation the simple, and one would have thought obvious, principle that if Jones has a right to meet his friends and sing hymns or preach in an orderly manner, his right to do so cannot be affected either by the fact that Bill Sykes and a lot of scoundrels threaten to punch Jones's head, or by the fact that a muddle-headed bench of magistrates hold that anything must be unlawful on Jones's part which leads Bill Sykes to break the peace.

The courts have done their duty. It is not,

however, certain whether even now the people or the executive have realized the justice and the necessity of insuring to the members of the Salvation Army, as to all other citizens, the free enjoyment of their lawful rights. Here, as in the conduct of the House of Commons with regard to Mr. Bradlaugh, may be perceived a symptom of one of the most threatening dangers of the day. This danger is the growth of a feeling that the practical exercise of legal rights ought to be dependent upon the popularity of the class or person who claims to exercise them. The majority of the House of Commons were unable to see that the question of Mr. Bradlaugh's admission to his seat was not a question of morals, but of law. Hosts of Englishmen appear unable to perceive, or rather to feel, that violent interference by ruffians with the Salvation Army compromises the whole right of public meeting. Assume, in the face of all evidence, that the Salvationists are a body of canting hypocrites; assume, what has certainly not yet been proved, that the proceedings of the Army are so conducted as to be a nuisance to quiet people, and therefore ought to be put down by legal means: these assumptions, even if true, do not go one step toward lessening the danger and the inexpediency of allowing violent mobs to take the law into their own hands. The cause of General Booth is, in this matter, the cause of every Roman Catholic, Secularist, Quaker, or Jew throughout the land. It is, in fact, the cause of every man who is or may be the advocate of an unpopular cause. The mob who attack the Salvationists to-day may burn a Roman Catholic chapel to-morrow, or may take a fancy a week hence to wreck a Jewish synagogue. Recent experience does not justify the conviction that the principles of toleration and justice are so firmly grounded in the conscience of Europe that English mobs can be allowed to play at persecution.

Your readers must forgive me for having bored them with the commonplaces of political morality. The thing to be noted is, that these commonplaces, obvious as they are, have not as yet impressed themselves firmly on the minds of the English public. One circumstance to a slight extent explains, though it does not justify, the obtuseness of popular sentiment with regard to the Salvation Army. It is clearly just and expedient that the Salvationists should enjoy undisturbed all the legal rights of citizens: it is clear that among these rights must be included the unrestricted right of meeting in public, in a lawful manner, for the promotion of any lawful purpose. It is not, however, quite so clear—the matter is one on which I have no intention of pronouncing any opinion whatever—that the Government ought not to possess the power by law of occasionally restricting, on grounds of general policy, the unlimited right of public meeting. The English people, at any rate, it may be suspected, feel that, in politics no less than in religion, things may be lawful which are not expedient, and therefore are apathetic in duly supporting the exercise of rights which common sense suggests it is, under certain circumstances, inexpedient to exercise.

A. V. DICEY.

GRUCKER'S LITERARY DEVELOPMENT OF GERMANY.—I.

PARIS, January 6, 1883.

GERMAN literature is distinguished by the part which critical science—the theoretical study of literary and of æsthetic principles—plays in it. The critic comes before the poet, and sometimes inspires him. The most famous poetical inventors and writers—Lessing, Klopstock, Goethe, Schiller, Novalis—have been

philosophers; they have all been, to use the German terminology, objective and subjective at the same time. Boerne says that "the Germans always start from principles. Is it necessary to take out a spot in a coat? they first begin by studying chemistry, and they study it so well and so long that meanwhile the coat has fallen to pieces." M. Grucker, an Alsatian by birth, now Professor of Foreign Literature in the Faculty of Letters at Nancy, has just given us an excellent 'History of Literary and Æsthetic Doctrine in Germany.' It is full of the most valuable information. He shows us how weak, how divided and barren Germany was left after the Thirty Years' War. "Modern German literature," he says, "from Opitz to Gottsched, taken in the whole, is not the product of the free expansion of the national and popular genius; it is the result of a slow and difficult work of imitation, of artificial reproduction, aided, provoked by the study of rules, of poetics, of models borrowed from abroad." Herder says the same thing: "We came too late, and as we came too late, we imitated others. We imitated the French, the Spaniards, the Italians, the English; we hardly knew why. Our venerable Opitz was an imitator more than a poet, and in Weckherlin almost everything is borrowed from abroad."

In the middle of the eighteenth century German literature first becomes original; but the work of inspiration continues to be always accompanied and helped by the work of criticism. Criticism, in fact, becomes then a real science; it has a depth, an importance, unknown in other countries; it becomes a branch of philosophy, of literature, of history. The marriage, the close connection, which is established between literature and philosophy is the characteristic trait of German development. Every literary reform is caused by a philosophical reform. The philosophy of Wolf acts on Gottsched, the philosophy of Leibnitz on Lessing, the philosophy of Kant on Schiller, the philosophy of Fichte and the philosophy of Schelling on the Romantic school. Such a connection has existed in other countries: it is, for instance, impossible not to feel the influence of Descartes on the great French writers of the century of Louis XIV.; it is impossible not to see how the sensualism of the eighteenth century acted on Voltaire and his contemporaries. But the connection is nowhere so close, so complete as in Germany. Ritter has justly said: "More than any other, our literature is impregnated with philosophical ideas. Our greatest philosophers have in themselves something of the poet, and, as for most of our poets, it is difficult to say if they are poets rather than philosophers."

M. Grucker begins by giving a very graphic picture of German literature in the sixteenth century. This literature was essentially popular, but already Germany looked for models abroad. The powerful satirist Fischart was an imitator of Rabelais. There were two schools independent of each other: on one side, a neo-Latin literature, learned, but without life; on the other, a popular literature, trivial, coarse, represented by Sebastian Brant, by Hans Sachs. The legend of Faust, which was then created, combined, as it were, in its impersonality the popular inspirations with the boundless love of science and of intellectual domination which was already felt.

German had not even found a definitive language. Luther had used the Misnian dialect of Upper Saxony, which became the official *Kanzleisprache* of the Emperor; it soon triumphed over all the other local dialects. But after Luther, the language which he had formed was invaded by all sorts of Greek and Latin locutions. "German words," says Rückert,

"were only there like servants who carry the train of a gown." The new Latin movement was fatal to the language, and it is a marvel that the work of Luther was not entirely lost, especially when the French language, already formed, so elegant and so precise, became the social language in all the courts and circles of Germany.

After the horrors of the Thirty Years' War, the German spirit seemed completely dead. All the Princes became imitators of Louis XIV.; they all had their Versailles, their Marly. The first reaction against the invasion of foreign words and ideas was the modest creation of societies which called themselves *Sprachgesellschaften*. M. Grucker gives their history. The most important had been established at the beginning of the war, in 1617, at Weimar—the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft*. The founders were Ludwig and J. Casimir of Anhalt, Ernst, Friedrich, and Wilhelm, Dukes of Saxe-Weimar, and a few gentlemen. The object of the society was "respect in its integrity and in its true spirit for the noble maternal tongue, and its employment in their speeches and writings." The society was essentially aristocratic, but it admitted professors, poets, and writers. It lasted during the Thirty Years' War; some of its members were on the Protestant side, some on the side of the Emperor. It died only toward 1767, at the beginning of the wars against Louis XIV. M. Grucker mentions other societies less known—the *Aufrichtige Tannengesellschaft*, established in Strasbourg in 1633, the *Deutsch gesinnte Genossenschaft*, founded in 1643 at Hamburg by Philip von Zesen and Dietrich Petersen. These last were German in the extreme; Zesen called Venus "Weidinne," Vulcan "Gluthfang," Aurora "Rothinne," and so forth. In his eyes, Latin and Greek were dialects of German, and he believed that there were Germans at the siege of Troy. His attempt fell into ridicule, and it became an insult to be called a *Zesianer*. There is not much to be said of the *Gekrönte Blumenorden* established in 1641 at Nuremberg. The school of Nuremberg, as it is sometimes called, was devoted to allegory, to emblems, to bucolics; its members wore the classic names of shepherds—Damon, Floridor, etc.

The work of all these societies was less important than the work of a single man, Opitz, who first gave to German poetry rules, models, and principles. Opitz, it is true, unfaithful to the national and popular poetry, inspired himself with classic antiquity; he was, nevertheless, the reformer and the father of modern German literature. He played the part of Boileau; he was a sort of literary regent, the founder of criticism, a master of style and of prosody. Opitz was born in Silesia; at the age of twenty, when he was a mere student, he attempted a defence of the German language in his "Aristarchus sive de contemptu linguæ teutonice." It was a bold attempt, in an unknown young man, to protest against the abandonment of the national idiom, and to claim for it an honorable place by the Greek and Latin languages. His book, 'Von der deutschen Poeterey,' is a complete German 'Ars poetica.' This book has great analogies with the 'Illustration de la Langue française' of J. Du Bellay. Opitz was a great admirer of Du Bellay and of all the poets of the French Pleiad. But while Du Bellay wished to force as much Latin as possible into the French language, Opitz aimed to bring back the German language to its original purity; his reform was more rational than the reform of Du Bellay and of Ronsard, and therefore it was more successful. Opitz had his defects, as he was, in his private life, very selfish, cowardly, and worldly, and, in his own poetical attempts, dry, didactic, and sententious. He had no pas-

sion; he tries to defend poetry from the utilitarian point of view; in the various forms of poetry he sees chiefly the exterior and material parts. Still, his "reform" was of great use, as he really founded the laws of German prosody; his was the first serious attempt toward the constitution of a purely national literature. He became very popular in his lifetime, and was called "the prince of the German lyre." During the second part of the seventeenth century and the first part of the eighteenth the name of Opitz remained in Germany as the personification of true literary principles. He is the centre round which gravitate Paul Fleming, the best poet of his time, the author of fine sonnets and psalms, the epigrammatic Friedrich von Logau, the satirical Rachel, the religious Simon Dach, etc. Philip Harsdoerfer and his school, called the school of Nuremberg, also attempted the regeneration of German national poetry, but their work had not the same character as that of Opitz: they were more artificial, they applied themselves to what may be called the artifices of poetry, of rhythm and style; their influence was not permanent.

The work of reform found a powerful ally in Leibnitz. His writings on the German language had a very powerful influence. Leibnitz was one of those powerful minds which embrace all the science of an age; his principle was the independent and innate activity of all things, and their universal harmony. A language was, in his eyes, an organism which had its own laws of development. He was a great admirer of France, which in his time was at the head of civilization; but he was also a patriot, and his patriotism embraced the whole of Germany. He admired sincerely the German language, and he wrote two pamphlets, entitled 'Ermahnung an die Teutschen ihren Verstand und Sprache besser zu gesinnen, über samt beigefügtem Vorschlag einer Teutsch-Gesellschaft,' and 'Unvergeßliche Gedanken betreffend die Ausübung und Verbesserung der teutschen Sprache.' It is only recently that the German work of Leibnitz has been properly valued; his patriotism had been unjustly put in doubt—people only saw in him the philosopher, the diplomat, the cosmopolitan. He was obliged to use constantly the French and Latin languages, but he wrote often in German, and he truly appreciated the Teutonic language. He fully esteemed the efforts of the "language societies," but he thought they had devoted themselves too much to frivolous objects and to poetry. He desired that German should be employed on serious and substantial objects. The decadence of the German language seemed to him to be the outward form of the decadence of the nation. "There is between the language and the character of a people the same relation as between the moon and the sea." Leibnitz desired warmly the establishment of a German academy for the German language. He hoped to see his wish realized in the Academy of Berlin, founded in 1701, thanks to the influence of his pupil, the Queen Sophia-Charlotte. But French was the official language of this Academy, and scientific work soon became its exclusive preoccupation. Even at this hour, the Academy of Berlin is essentially an academy of sciences.

Leibnitz found an ally in the person of Christian Thomasius, the son of his own master, Jacob Thomasius, the apologist of Descartes. Thomasius the son was himself a Cartesian; he separated jurisprudence from theology; he did the same for morals, regarded as an independent science. He delivered his lectures at Leipzig in German, and he founded the first German periodical, under the somewhat compendious title of *Freimüthige, lustige und ernsthafte jedoch vernunft- und gezeizmässige Gedanken*,

oder Monatsgespräche über Alles, fürnehmlich aber neue Bücher. His profession of faith is condensed in a pamphlet called 'Von der Nachahmung der Franzosen,' the programme of the intellectual emancipation of Germany. Thomasius does full justice to the French, to their best qualities; but his admiration is not blind. He may be considered as the founder of the *Popularphilosophie*. He was one of the chief promoters of the use of the German language in every department of social and intellectual life.

Correspondence.

THE NATION AND PROHIBITION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Some, at least, of the readers of your journal read, in the issue of Jan. 11, your answer to the letter of Mr. Turnbull on prohibition with some surprise and more pleasure. Its positions, if consistently and firmly applied in their own spirit, can hardly fail to result in all the action that the sober advocates of prohibition are asking. Notwithstanding the variety of opinion and practice on the subject of temperance, you believe, if we understand you, in a law that shall repress intemperance, and look to its ultimate extinction in prohibition, and that this end is to be reached as rapidly as law supported by public opinion can be made to perform its function of repression. Prohibitionists might wish to alter somewhat the emphasis of your response, but would hardly desire to modify its fundamental principle. The fact that "a great majority of moralists, legislators, and teachers approve of or do not sharply condemn" the daily use of intoxicating drinks, is a reason neither with you nor with the prohibitionist against the use of law as an adjunct of public opinion, in overcoming a social evil rooted in social sentiment. In this relation of its work to public sentiment, the temperance reform does but follow in the steps of the anti-slavery movement. This one principle contains, we apprehend, for the sound mind, the entire temperance programme. Every other question becomes ultimately a question of facts under it. Honest majorities are entitled to shape the law to the ends of restriction and prohibition, provided they shape it wisely and execute it firmly. Majorities are won on this subject, as on all subjects, by effort; and the power to execute a law lies in the same direction with the ability to secure the law, and is attained by the same means. A "good license law" will no more enact itself or care for itself than a prohibitory law. Indeed, it has less power to care for itself than a prohibitory law, as it keeps good the seeds of mischief, and implies a weaker and more wavering social sentiment.

If we add to this first truth another principle contained in another portion of the same issue of your journal—"no punishment prevents all crime, and the object of punishment is always to diminish the amount of crime; and if it does this, it is efficacious, even if much crime is still committed"—we shall see that the entire question between the *Nation* and the prohibitionist is one of the interpretation of existing facts. The prohibitionist would say that the facts, in Maine for instance, under the above principle, fully justify prohibition. The law is so thoroughly sustained by public sentiment, and so widely enforced, as greatly to reduce intemperance, as powerfully to aid moral means in the formation of public sentiment, and as steadily to prepare the way for still better results. It thus sufficiently, if not fully, sustains its dignity as

law, and is kept for the purposes of execution, and not for those of expression.

JOHN BASCOM.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON,
January 20, 1883.

[It would be difficult for us to conceive of two agitations so dissimilar as to their objective point than the anti-slavery and prohibitionist agitations. The one aimed at the protection of certain individuals from wholesale robbery—*i. e.*, the deprivation of all civil rights at the hands of certain other individuals; the other aims at a compulsory change in the private personal habits of some persons, in order to set a good example to other persons. Your duties to your neighbor, in all outward relations to him, have hitherto been enforced by all systems of legislation. They all compel you to refrain from violence to him, to refrain from slandering or provoking him, and to pay him what you owe him, in money or goods. The anti-slavery agitation sought to give the negro the benefit of the Ten Commandments. The prohibitionist agitation, on the other hand, seeks to impose self-denial on each man in the regulation of his own life in his own house, so that others whom he never saw may not be led into temptation. This may be a good kind of legislation, but it is a new kind, and enormously difficult of enforcement; and it is a good objection to a law, always has been, and always will be in every rational community which does not play at lawmaking, that it cannot be enforced, or can be enforced only with great difficulty, which always means, only in a small number of cases.

The prohibitory movement does not therefore follow in the steps of the anti-slavery movement. It opens up an absolutely new path of its own. It aims at converting a moral duty, and hitherto a self-regarding duty, into a public and legal duty, and tries to get legislation which it admits cannot be enforced, on the plea that if it gets time it will create public sentiment enough to enforce it. The wildest and most fantastic legislation might be justified in the same way. There is in this field no limit to absurdity. The proposition that "the power to execute a law lies in the same direction with the ability to secure the law, and is attained by the same means," we do not fully understand. If it means that you can always execute any law you can get passed, it is notoriously untrue. If it means that you are entitled to have any law passed that you would like to see passed, because your motives are good, it is simple nonsense. As to the experiment in Maine, the prohibitionist who would say that it justified prohibition under any principle we have laid down would, in our estimation, say what was not true, and give a wholly deceptive impression of its working. The law is openly and systematically violated, to our personal knowledge, in a way that no other law on the statute-book is or could be. These misrepresentations and delusions are a very bad feature in the agitation. A considerable number of sumptuary laws, intended to regulate the private lives of citizens, have been passed before now in the New England States and other countries, but public opinion did

not grow up to them, and they have been abandoned. They were doubtless in some degree obeyed. We do not say this will be the case with the prohibitory laws, but we do say that the friends of prohibition seriously injure their cause by their exaggerations, perversions, and evasions.—ED. NATION.]

CO-EDUCATION IN WISCONSIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The remarks in your review of 'Tow-head,' as to the degree of importance to be attributed to its picture of life at the "University of the Three Lakes," are perfectly just. I should never have given any thought to what is obviously a novelist's license in placing fictitious characters and occurrences in a real locality, but that I see some Eastern periodicals have taken the fiction for good earnest, and are crying out in alarm at the dangers of co-education. I do not intend to deny that the incidents described in this book *might* possibly have taken place here, where Miss McLean spent a few months, just as they might have taken place at Mt. Holyoke, where she also spent some time, and just as we know for a certainty they do take place in society with young girls who are not attending any school at all. But this is certainly no truthful picture of the relation of the sexes under co-education. I think that any unprejudiced observer would agree, first, that improprieties of conduct are far less common here than in society at large; secondly, that they have been steadily diminishing during the ten years or so that the system has been in operation. The great majority of our students, especially the girls, come here to work, not to flirt; and I have never known a more industrious, better-behaved, and more lady-like set of girls than those in our classrooms. Those who do not care to study find themselves out of their element very soon, and go somewhere else. Anybody who chooses to consult the first chapter of 'Cape Cod Folks'—a book of genuine humor and descriptive power, which I read with the greatest enjoyment—will find a candid statement of the reasons why the authoress left one school after another, I have no doubt this University among them. I enclose an extract from a review of the book in our students' paper, which shows how it is regarded by the students themselves; and the remark made to me once, in perfectly good faith, by one of our young-lady students, that she understood the girls in Eastern schools often behaved with great impropriety, shows how easy it is to see the bad side of things in other communities and other kinds of institutions.

WILLIAM F. ALLEN.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON,
January 16, 1883.

RELIGIOUS DISCIPLINE AT HARVARD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Harvard College has long had the reputation of being the most liberal university in this country. That this reputation is a just one in most respects I do not at all dispute. But as far as her attitude on the subject of religious training is concerned, the Cambridge university is as far from liberal as the most orthodox and strict of her sister colleges of the West. Her position is at once illogical and childish. According to the present arrangement, every student is compelled to go to chapel exercises four mornings in every week. All members of the three lower classes are required to attend some designated church every Sunday in the college year with the exception of six. Seniors, however, are allowed to use their own discretion in

regard to their attendance at church. In chapel the presence or absence of a student is marked by a special monitor. As far as church attendance is concerned, the matter is left entirely to each student's honor; he is required only to sign a paper at the end of the year stating that he has attended the church to which he had been assigned every Sunday in the year, except when specially excused. That this whole system is a ridiculous one is perfectly obvious. It simply offers a premium on dishonesty. Men who would scorn to tell an untruth, and consider their word sacred in all other matters, do not scruple to tell the most barefaced lies when the matter of attendance at church or chapel is in question.

Every other Tuesday morning the names of dozens of students are posted as having been fortunate enough to have their petitions granted. Most of the petitions are requests to be excused for absence from church or chapel on such trivial grounds as sore throat or a cold. As morning prayers do not come until a quarter before nine, it is hard to see how a cold can prevent a man's going to chapel at that time, when he is obliged to go out just as early to get his breakfast, and probably attends a nine-o'clock recitation. With the same reckless disregard for the truth, men will sign a paper at the end of the year stating that they have attended church on every Sunday in the year, when they have not seen the inside of a church for years. Indeed, it is quite a common boast for a man to say when he graduates that he has never been in church since he entered college, four years before. Such regard for the truth does Harvard's system of religious training inculcate in its victims! And yet President Eliot, in his last report, makes the remark that "the service [that at morning prayers is referred to] is impressive, edifying, and interesting, and he who can attend it for years without sometimes being touched by it and moved to better living, must be a very insensible and earth-bound person." President Eliot forgets that when a man is compelled to listen to anything, the subject is apt to become very distasteful, however interesting it may be under other circumstances. As a matter of fact, this service, "impressive, edifying, and interesting" as it is, inspires most students with a vindictive and life-long hatred of all the forms and associations connected with it. Many a student has vowed that after he left college he would never enter a church again.

The statistics in regard to the various religious beliefs entertained by the students that were taken a year or so ago were most imperfect and unreliable, as they were taken with the express intention of deceiving. At that time, the members of one religious sect in college desired to be allowed to build a chapel in the grounds. To influence the authorities, a zealous member of the society, through one of the papers—an organ of his—attempted to show that the members of that sect were in the majority. To do this, the returns were falsified to a large extent. Men who were known to belong to other sects were often not approached, but put down as "not visited." Many men would put themselves down as belonging to that particular church to humor the canvasser. Known sceptics were not visited at all. In one class in college in which there were, to my certain knowledge and among my acquaintance, at least a dozen "agnostics," but three agnostics were given. None of my acquaintance saw the canvasser at all. The list was drawn up for a purpose, and the designers did not scruple at any means to bring about the desired end. As a result, the public have the opinion that Harvard is more religious than she really is. The fact is, that there are many men here with no avowed religion who are driven

into radical scepticism by the odious system of religious training in vogue. Forced religious training will always make men antagonistic to religious orthodoxy. They know that the Faculty and Corporation are fully aware of the number of lies that are told, and the apparent unconcern with which these lies are received makes students suspicious of men who can countenance a system that allows such evils.

It is not hard to show how illogical the system is. If seniors are allowed to exercise their own judgment in regard to church attendance, why should they not have the same privilege in the case of morning prayers? And if seniors are to decide for themselves on the plea of more advanced age, why should not the parents of the under-class men decide for them? The bad logic of the regulations is as plain as a pikestaff, and no amount of preaching and praying will atone for the evil the system does.

This is the system that caused a college paper last year to remind Harvard graduates about to vote for overseers that these overseers were the men who, in spite of the expressed desire of the Faculty, kept this system fastened upon us, and to call upon the graduates to depose all opponents of voluntary prayers. So, in the same way, I, in the name of the students of Harvard University, call upon every alumnus to oppose the election of any man to be an overseer in that University who is not in favor of voluntary prayers and common sense.

A STUDENT.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., Jan. 18, 1883.

THE INTERESTS OF AMERICAN ART TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you allow me to be so rude as to suggest, through your columns, that an "American Artist," who writes in the *Nation* for December 14 a very lame defence of the protective policy, so far as art goes, is thinking more of his pocket (and mistakenly, at that) than of the good of art and its cultivation in America? He don't see the subject fairly.

The patronage of art is peculiar in its relation to political economy. Articles of an already created necessity will come in or be made at home, and the question of a protection to the home manufacture is one which can be supported by plausible arguments, although even here I hope it will be seen before many years that the protective policy is one of making water run up hill—it always costs more in the end to the nation at large than it comes to, and should never be resorted to except when it relates to articles whose home production is necessary to our independence and safety. But a protective tariff on works of art is a double fallacy. It is only the seeing of pictures which induces purchasing them, and therefore the more good pictures people see the more they are induced to purchase. The importation of pictures is in the main of two classes: good pictures by European masters, and cheap pictures which come in as furniture. The former do not compete with the pictures of our native artists, as they are high-priced and bought for their reputation or surpassing excellence in their kind by people who can afford to buy everything they fancy strongly in this way. Their introduction should be encouraged in every possible way, firstly, for their refining influence on public taste; secondly, as affording a school of art at home which gives a better training to our own painters; and thirdly, because the effect of a development of taste leads to the more bountiful patronage of the home art so improved. Every true artist will pray for the introduction of as much good art as possible, and without any hindrance of the tariff; the artists (if) who live by painting pictures which a cultivation of the public taste would render unsalable are not entitled

to consideration, and ought to be encouraged to adopt some other profession or trade.

Now, as to the bad pictures—i. e., the cheap, trashy things which are turned out at small prices by poorly paid hack painters—they also interfere with no good art, as no one buys them who knows what art is, but people who want something cheap to decorate their walls with, and if they don't take these they take chromos of the same character. They are not obliged to have pictures as they are to have books, and making these poor canvases as dear as the work of our own painters of repute would only prevent them buying anything, while, on the contrary, beginning with these as cheap objects, their ambition rises with cultivation, and they will presently have something better in their best room. But as a rule, people buy pictures of favorite artists if they care for art, and cheapness is no recommendation any more than it would be for diamonds.

The "art interests of the whole people," of which an "American Artist" so patriotically talks, demand the best art to be diffused as widely as possible, and that art shall not be raised in its cost to the people without regard to its true value by any artificial restriction. They demand the art education of the whole people as well as of the particular artist who is to do the work for the people, we will hope, by and by. Our legislation makes a partial and absurd provision for the supposed interest of artists, as against those of art, by exempting from duty the works of American artists residing abroad; but on what grounds should a painter or sculptor especially be exempted from paying taxes on his work because he lives and labors abroad, where he can exist and work more cheaply than at home, and pay no taxes of any kind, any more than an American shipbuilder who builds his ships in a foreign dock-yard? The sculptor abroad employs foreign labor to as great an extent as the shipbuilder—all the practical work is done by men whose labor is as taxable as that of the workmen in electro-plated ware or ship-building. Why is this, but to aid in the education of our artists—not certainly to enable them to live abroad (which for native art is the worst of all policies); and if to aid that education, why not logically carry it further and let pictures come in to educate us? The protection of books does come logically into our illogical system of political economy, because the capital and labor involved in the production of books are pure trade interests, and, combined with our systematic piracy of foreign brains, the tariff on books probably does not make books dearer or discourage their production, for the books which without the tariff would be printed abroad are now printed at home, but the pictures will not be painted at home even if our tariff should be prohibitory. Men who paint great pictures at Paris would not be induced to come to New York to paint them by the imposition of a duty, which is the case, *mutatis mutandis*, with books; and when we have a native Bastien-Lepage painting in New York he will command as high prices as he who now paints in Paris. *Ceteris paribus*, a native art will always be preferred by all people who love art, because the motive will have a stronger appeal than a foreign motive would. The law of supply and demand has no bearing, for the rule is reversed—the supply creates the demand, and the demand increases with the supply. Within certain limits, not yet reached with us, the production of good pictures as a general thing stimulates purchase.

Our protective system is a gross absurdity from beginning to end, but the absurdity bursts into blossom in the art department. We tax ancient art, which we need for study, so heavily that it amounts to prohibition, though protection is out

of the question, and we don't need the trivial revenue we get from it. We have no old art to protect, and the tax on it only tends to keep it out of the country, while our art education calls for it with an increasing persistency. We encourage our artists to go abroad, again, when we ought, from aesthetic as well as economical reasons, to make it for their interest to stay at home: living abroad cheaply, they pay no taxes, and get assistant labor cheaply; living at home, they pay taxes and employ dear labor if they employ any. Therefore we take off the tax from the former category and thereby handicap the latter. I belong to the former, but it does not prevent my seeing the absurdity of the system. If I am any judge of the merits of the question, what we want in the interests of art and the artists is exemption of all purely artistic work from any duty whatever, and equally so of all applied art or articles of ornament and household decoration produced more than a century ago—i. e., bric-à-brac, furniture, etc., etc., in which utility is the secondary consideration.—Yours truly,

ANOTHER AMERICAN ARTIST.

FLORENCE, December 29, 1882.

SOUTHERN HOMICIDE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: To offset that "Old Subscriber" in Richmond whom you have so recently lost, I enclose \$3, for which you will please send the *Nation* for '83 to a new subscriber, likewise in Richmond. I hope he may make a better use of it than the one you have lost, and may concern himself far more about seeking a remedy for this plague-spot on the civilization of the South than about your motives in probing it.

ANOTHER OLD SUBSCRIBER.

[The following letter, which appeared in the Richmond *State* of January 18, is an important contribution to the discussion so long carried on in these columns.—ED. NATION.]

"To the Editor of The State:

"In your editorial of December 28, headed 'Why We Are Slandered!' you took the New York *Nation* most severely to task for its malice toward the South, as exhibited in its recent articles on Southern homicide. Your concluding paragraph was as follows:

"So plausible and so cunningly contrived has been the *Post-Nation's* trickery, that it has recently published letters of commendation from two individuals in Virginia—one of them writing from Richmond—who were either fools or knaves, being either too silly to detect the injury that paper is doing our people, or too treacherous to refrain from endorsing slanders against their own friends and neighbors. Their affected 'liberalism,' however, is made naught by the exposure of the *Post-Nation's* over-zeal in its foul work of abuse, and these two writers from Virginia, if they be real and known, should not fail to suffer the penalty of their treachery, and be forced, as the slanderers of their own people, to remain forever renegades from society, unworthy of the trust of honest men."

"One of these writers, Mr. Editor, is as 'real' as people usually are, is 'known' by some few people in Richmond and elsewhere, and, without any 'affectation' in the matter, he sees that it would be plainly illiberal to take umbrage at the terms used, seeing that editors of daily papers have to write in great haste, often, too, in the heat of political controversy, and that in this case the words were directed against some anonymous writer, the spirit of whose article you misunderstood. Everything personal being thus buried out of sight, I gladly avail myself of your courteous offer to let me defend in the columns of your paper the article in the *Nation* of December 21, over the signature of 'X. Q. Z.', an article prompted, I assure you, by a devoted love for our common country. I do it the more cheerfully, as I fully recognize the noble work the *State* has done in striving to uphold the cause of honesty in opposition to the spirit of repudiation that has been so prevalent in our land.

"The charges of the *Nation* may be briefly stated thus:

"1st. That the South is characterized by a barbarous homicidal spirit pervading it to an extent unknown in any other civilized community.

"2d. That the homicides by which the South is thus peculiarly disgraced take place among its better class of citizens, and occur in settlement of social or business disputes. With the murders committed by ruffians it has nothing to do.

"3d. That the Southern sense of the sacredness of human life is so greatly weakened that these homicides are rarely punished. This last point is perhaps the one on which it lays the greatest stress. It has offered its columns to any Southerner who will send reports of the hanging of the men guilty of these 'social and business homicides,' but not one has yet been published.

"In an editorial some time ago the *Nation* took the ground that this lawless spirit has much to do with retarding the influx of immigration and capital into the South.

"I leave you, Mr. Editor, to tell your readers whether I have fairly stated the *Nation's* position.

"The rebukes of this journal have sometimes been so stingingly severe as to make any true friend of the South writhe with mortification and pain, and feel his blood boil. Many Southerners deny the charges altogether, and attribute them to sheer malice on the part of the *Nation*. But of one thing I have become convinced, after much discussion and careful attention to the matter, that, whatever may be the motive that actuates this Northern archer, his terrible shafts inflict such keen pain because they are barbed with too much truth, and I am earnestly anxious to see the South I love roused to a right view of the matter. I therefore wrote a brief article for the *Nation*, taking the ground that the wise course for its Southern readers was to give their main attention to determining whether the charge is in any fair degree true of us; and if so—and many devoted Southerners, I said, 'lament that it is only too true'—to do all in their power to correct the evil.

"I base my patriotism, Mr. Editor, upon this principle: 'Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.' The fact is manifest that we in the South are too greatly chargeable with the sin of which the *Nation* accuses us. I know men who fought for the South during the war, and no doubt are as true patriots now as then, who say that the charge in the main is true. I know three Virginia editors who in private will say the same thing.

"The Louisville *Courier-Journal* (as quoted by the *Nation* of January 11) says of Polk's defalcation: 'If he had killed a man in heat and passion, or if he had coldly assassinated him, the effect would have been different, and his condemnation much less certain. In the Southern States we can find it in our hearts to forgive a murderer, but the crime of theft we punish more rigidly when we catch the thief.' The Charleston (S. C.) *News and Courier*, also quoted by the *Nation*, admits the frequency of these brutal street-fights in the South, attributing them to a general public sentiment that lacks the 'finer courage' which would resort to the law for the redress of private wrongs. In 1880 a South Carolina judge, in his charge to the Grand Jury respecting the carrying of concealed weapons, said in substance that South Carolina was red with the blood of its sons shed by the hands of their brothers.

"As to the hanging of these murderers, who of us ever hears of it! Isn't it almost an impossible thing to get a white man hung in the South? A few days ago I read in a Lynchburg paper that in the first eight weeks of his Governorship Alexander H. Stephens pardoned forty-nine convicts out of the penitentiary, twelve of them being murderers!

"As to the animus of the *Nation*, I have this to say, that while I myself prefer to believe it to be honest in disclaiming any malice toward us, yet in this state of affairs we cannot afford to attend to that. A man returning home at night and told that his house is on fire, does not bother himself with the animus of his informant. In such a crisis he would hardly stop to notice this; and yet, if he were thus enabled to rescue those dearest to him, he would hold himself, in a certain measure, indebted to his informant, even if the latter showed great glee in giving the tidings.

"Now, Mr. Editor, what shall those of us do who desire to see this blot removed from the reputation of our beloved South? I know of a Southern journal that took up the matter some years ago, but now is content to let it rest, because it met so much criticism and misrepresentation at the hands of Southerners. If we try to do a little good by addressing the *Nation's* Southern readers, our motives are misunderstood and violently assailed. Will you not, Mr. Editor, throw your influence on the side of right

and of law, and induce other Southern journals to do the same? Perhaps the *Nation* will then retire from the discussion, and the *State* will have the proud distinction of again battling in a righteous cause, in spite of the violent prejudice it will encounter. But if our own papers will not do this, then I say—and I say it boldly, and because I love the South—I bid the *Nation* Godspeed in its work of stirring up the Southern conscience, and trust it will calmly hold on its way till this crying evil is abated.

"I thank you, Mr. Editor, for your kindness in allowing me so much of your valuable space to maintain views with which you, perhaps, do not altogether sympathize.—Yours, respectfully,

"ADDISON HOGE.

"HAMPTON-SIDNEY COLLEGE, PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY, VA."

"P. S.—Since I wrote the above I have received the *Dispatch* of Friday, with an account of a typical Southern murder, such as the *Nation* charges against us. It was a street murder, one count in the *Nation's* indictment; murderer and victim were both 'prominent men,' second count; it was a 'business homicide,' as the *Nation* calls it, the dispute being about a sum of money owed by one to the other, third count; the 'concealed weapon' was on hand, fourth count; and, finally, the tragedy is 'deeply deplored,' fifth count. Now, remember, indignant Southerners, that the *Nation* offers its columns to any of you who will report a case where one of these 'terrible tragedies' is so 'deeply deplored' as to result in the hanging of the man-slayer. The files of the *State* and *Dispatch* for the last few months could, no doubt, show a dozen or more similar murders, but I have never yet read of a hanging, though I do read of acquittals and pardons. Now let us watch and see whether the authorities of Monroe, La., will visit any fitting punishment on McClain.

"I hear people say, 'Why don't the *Nation* correct the sins of the North? It could find plenty of work to do.' I reply: Do our own papers render this needless by their own endeavors to correct such a gigantic evil? In a paper which I have taken for years I remember several rather recent (I think) editorials taking the New York dailies to task for their immense conceit in supposing that New York is the whole country. But, as far as I recollect, I have never yet seen it lift a finger toward educating its thousands of readers in the only right view of this matter—certainly not in the last few months since the *Nation* took the matter up. A. H."

THE DATING OF BOOKS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Another practice which cannot meet with too severe condemnation seems to be gaining ground among publishers. I allude to the habit of placing *no date* on published books. Perhaps this is less reprehensible, from a strict moral standpoint, than giving a false date, but it is certainly very annoying.

For example, the latest edition of Perry's 'Elements of Political Economy' was published by Charles Scribner's Sons in 1879 or 1880, but no date whatever appears on the title-page. The edition is merely called a "new" edition, and the number of the edition even omitted, so that readers are at a loss to tell how new it really is.

TRUE DATE.

MILWAUKEE, January 7, 1883.

Notes.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & Co. have brought out Dr. Holmes's 'The Poet at the Breakfast Table,' in the style of its elegant companion volume, 'The Autocrat,' issued just before Christmas. The old Holmes mansion in Cambridge is represented in the frontispiece. With 'Twice-Told Tales' and 'Mosses from an Old Manse,' the same publishers begin a Riverside Edition of Hawthorne's works in twelve volumes, crown octavo, including in an appendix 'The Ancestral Footstep.' Each volume is to contain a brief introduction by Mr. George P. Lathrop, and an original etching, and by midsummer the edition will be complete. The two before us are quiet specimens of tasteful bookmaking, and Mr. La-

throp's prefatory notes are correspondingly direct and business-like. They give the necessary information concerning the circumstances out of which each composition grew. Two references to the "eleventh volume" of this edition, while no numbering appears upon either cover or title-page of the initial reprints, are explained by the easily overlooked bastard title.

A commendable anonymous translation of such parts of Plato as reveal the personality of his master was published some five years ago by Charles Scribner's Sons, under the title 'Socrates.' This has now been reissued in a cheaper, pamphlet form.

The Maine Historical Society have reprinted the newspaper reports, which had become unprocurable, of their proceedings in celebration of Longfellow's seventy-fifth birthday, February 27, 1882. The result is a handsome volume, containing a steel portrait of the poet, and views of the Stephenson house, in which he was born, and of the Longfellow house proper (Portland: Hoyt, Fogg & Donham).

A second edition of Sachs's 'Text-book of Botany, Morphological and Physiological,' could not be made after the lapse of seven years without some modifications. The Clarendon Press intrusted these to Mr. Sydney H. Vines, of Christ's College, Cambridge, and they consist in a rewriting of the first thirty-two pages, in sundry corrections and additions in the text and notes, and in an appendix. This beautiful and authoritative work is therefore prepared for at least another half decade of usefulness (New York: Macmillan & Co.).

We have received two additional volumes of the Clarendon Press Series: (1) 'Æschylus: Agamemnon,' by A. Sidgwick, known to Americans as the author of two works on Greek Prose Composition, adapted for use in this country by Professor White, of Harvard, and as one of those minutely accurate scholars who regard a false quantity as something analogous to the unpardonable sin, and an ingenious conjectural emendation of the text of a Greek play as a masterpiece of high art. He has certainly given us a very scholarly and useful edition of the 'Agamemnon.' The critical apparatus accompanying the text is unusually full and carefully selected. Of the convenience, the typographical neatness, and general excellence of these editions of the classics, we have before repeatedly spoken. (2) 'Uniplanar Kinematics of Solids and Fluids, with Applications to the Distribution and Flow of Electricity,' by George M. Minchin, Professor of Applied Mathematics in the Royal Indian Engineering College, is a purely mathematical treatise on the laws of motion where the motion is confined to one plane, or planes parallel to one plane. It takes us at once into the domain of the differential and integral calculus, which, in the end, is really the shortest and only scientific and satisfactory manner of treating the subject. To get the full benefit of the work, it is advisable to have at hand the 'Treatise on Statics' by the same author, one of the volumes of the same series.

A second edition of Mr. Henry C. Lea's 'Studies in Church History' is now passing through the press.

Roberts Brothers, Boston, have reprinted the 'Autobiography of Mrs. Fletcher,' which we noticed upon its first appearance. This confirms the correctness of our opinion that the book would have a place of its own for the sake of its testimony to the general spirit of the times, in spite of its lack of novel or specially interesting incidents.

The Rev. J. B. Harrison's letters on "The Condition of Niagara Falls," contributed to the New York Evening Post and Tribune and Boston Advertiser, have been gathered into a pamphlet,

and may be had of the writer (whose address is Franklin Falls, New Hampshire) by those who are desirous of joining the good work of redeeming a continental pleasure-ground from disfigurement and desecration. Petitions accompany the pamphlet.

William S. Gottsberger has in press and will shortly issue a translation of Dr. Georg Ebers's new romance, 'Ein Wort.'

'A Life of Adoniram Judson,' the famous pioneer missionary to Burmah, by his son, the Rev. Edward Judson, is in the press of A. D. F. Randolph & Co.

John W. Lovell Co. have arranged with the Rev. R. Heber Newton to publish the sermons, now in course of delivery, on "The Right and Wrong Uses of the Bible," in one volume.

A limited number of copies of the late Richard D. Webb's 'Life of John Brown'—the very last of the Dublin edition (not made from plates)—has been sent to this country by Mr. Alfred Webb, to be sold for the benefit of Mrs. Brown. They can be procured at the office of the Woman's Journal in Boston, the price being \$2. This is the standard biography of John Brown, and the photographic portrait which accompanies it is also the best that has been published. The book, from its scarcity, already commands an advanced price.

The 'Tribune Almanac' for 1883, edited by Mr. Edward McPherson, is now obtainable. Every editor and most politicians know its utility; but any citizen will find it valuable for reference. Besides electoral statistics, it gives abstracts of recent acts of Congress and of party platforms; constitutional amendments; tables of trade, banking, revenue, public debt, illiteracy; lists of public and State officers, etc., etc.

We can recommend for brevity, intelligibility, and general soundness Dr. B. C. Faust's 'Laws of Health,' which has been translated and prepared for school use by the publisher (Brooklyn, N. Y.: Hermann Kopp & Co.). Some dogmatism will be detected, as in teaching that "the head should rest on a pillow a hand's breadth in height"; and the instruction in the appendix about diluting and otherwise correcting cow's milk for infancy we believe to be antiquated.

Miss Hewins continues, in the January *Bulletin* of the Hartford Library Association, her good offices to the young by printing a full list of works on English and American History for children, thus anticipating a portion of her forthcoming 'Books for the Young,' which will be published by F. Leyboldt.

Some belated but still available "Reading Notes on Herbert Spencer and his works" appear in the January *Bulletin* of the Philadelphia Mercantile Library, prepared by Mr. John Edmunds.

The Bridgeport (Conn.) Public Library has just had the good fortune to be made heir to a fine building, valued at \$90,000, admirably suited to its needs. The legacy was contained in the will of Mrs. Pettengill, widow of a former editor of the Bridgeport *Standard*.

The seventeenth annual report of the Commissioners on Inland Fisheries (Boston, 1883) indicates by its very title the lead which Massachusetts has taken in pisciculture. It appears that four years were lost by an experiment with California salmon, which were found not to thrive on the Atlantic coast. The distribution of German carp has not produced such results as might have been expected, owing to the negligence of the recipients in protecting them against other fish, etc.

There has recently been published in England a little book which all lovers of books would like to read, but which no lover of books ought to read if he has any respect for his eyes. 'The Book-Lover's Enchiridion: Thoughts on the

Solace and Companionship of Books, Selected and Chronologically Arranged by Philobiblos' (New York: Scribner & Welford) is its title, and its form is a tiny 32mo or 48mo, printed in diamond type. To read its 237 pages is almost impossible without the use of a strong glass and of stronger language than is becoming in a book-lover. The matter of the book is worthy of a better setting; it is a collection—not altogether exhaustive or highly critical—of the wise things said by sages of all times and climes in praise of books, beginning with Solomon and ending with the quotation of Longfellow's sonnet on his books. The compiler is of a more catholic taste and of a wider reading than most of his fellow-Englishmen, as is proved by the abundant quotation from American writers, such as Irving, Emerson, Alcott, Holmes, and Beecher. But the compiler does not seem to have met with the books on reading prepared by Bishop Potter, President Porter, and Mr. F. R. Perkins. The little book is nicely bound in a white linen, covered with some palpable white color in fraudulent imitation of the purity of vellum.

The thirty-first volume of *L'Art* (J. W. Reinert) is rather overweighted with the long series of inedited designs by Jean Cousin for Hubert d'Anlezy's 'Liber Fortunæ.' No other feature is so marked. The old masters treated are Rubens (his works in the Louvre), Lucas van Leyden, Luca della Robbia, and Jacob Jordaens—all more or less fully illustrated. The English school are described with numerous portraits and specimens—Madox Brown, Burne Jones, Millais, Leighton, T. Faed, F. Holl, Kate Greenaway, etc. The Salon of 1882 and the Union Centrale des Arts Décoratifs are still further reviewed; and several chapters are devoted to the Museum of Cologne. There are several interesting examples of the Chaldean antiquities in the Louvre, and of the Bulak Museum. M. Flouvié eulogizes Benvenuto Cellini for his importunities in the matter of pay for his "Persons." Champfleury returns to a subject he had already touched with a light hand in *Le Livre*—the types and manner of the designers of the Romantic vignettes. Most interesting is a newly-discovered head of Henri IV, at twenty, among the portraits in the National Library. As usual, the volume is lavishly provided with full page etchings. A human as well as an artistic interest attaches to the domestic scene entitled "Camille Desmoulins."

It is pleasant to see in a French work such faultless spelling of English proper names as may be seen in Prof. W. F. Allen's review of American historical productions in the September-October number of the *Revue Historique* (Paris: Germer Baillière et Cie.)

Apropos of the recent troubles about Parliamentary oaths in Italy, Prof. R. Bonghi has a learned article in the *Nuova Antologia* for December 15. He reviews the cases that have arisen under the English Constitution, including Mr. Bradlaugh's, and in an appendix collects the oaths of various constitutional countries. Though the United States is represented, our "iron-clad oath" is not recorded.

Most annual necrologies will bear correction, and our last was no exception to the rule. It was not Luigi Palmieri, of the Vesuvius Station, who died, but Marino Palmieri, Professor of Physics at Naples.

—The Librarian of the Cincinnati Public Library writes us:

"There are two misstatements of fact in the paragraph in this week's *Nation* upon this Library which you may or not think of sufficient importance to correct. First, the Library has not abandoned its plan of publishing class lists; it has only temporarily suspended their issue. Second, the catalogue now being printed is not a dictionary catalogue like the Poole catalogue of 1871. It is called a finding list, and is more

nearly like that of the Chicago Public Library, issued by Mr. Poole. That is to say, it is a classified list of books, with only the authors, short titles, and numbers given in most cases. The arrangement is by subjects, and about 300 pages are now in print.⁵

—A correspondent writes us, with reference to a recent communication:

"The following is the only example of the use of the word 'lie' with the meaning referred to by 'H. W. H.' that I remember in my reading. In the 'Life of Bishop Wilberforce' there is a letter from the present Bishop of Ely (Dr. Woodford) describing Bishop Wilberforce's examinations for Ordination in which this sentence occurs: 'Hence, in sketching to the candidates, on the first morning, what he called the lie "of the day," he always put foremost the hours of prayer and meditation' (vol. I, p. 332). The italics of the word 'lie' and the remembrance of the particular phrase show that such a use of the word is uncommon."

—Apropos of the letters we have recently published on archaeological exploration in Greece, Mr. William Hyde Appleton writes us from Swarthmore, Pa.:

"But be it observed, with regard to Olympia, that it is not yet two years since the Germans left the place. The antiquities are for the most part housed and on exhibition. I visited Olympia last May, and feel amply rewarded for some little inconvenience suffered on the journey. I received from Mr. Demetriades, the Curator of the museums, a most cordial reception, though a stranger to him and unprovided with a single letter of introduction. During the two or three days of my stay he gave me every attention, and furnished me with every facility in his power for the prosecution of my studies. As regards the deficiencies at Olympia and elsewhere, I agree with your correspondent that 'it is less the will to remedy this state of things that is wanting to the Society than the resources, where there is so much to do.' These resources, too, may at any moment be augmented, for a long chapter might be written upon the benefactions of wealthy Greeks to their country. Indeed, I was told at Olympia that money either had already been given, or was about to be given, by a private individual for the very object in question—the erection at that place of a suitable museum building."

—The *Atlantic* for February contains an article on "Stage Rosalinds," by Mr. Richard Grant White, which those who are interested in the Shaksperian stage, including Mrs. Langtry and her critics, will find well worth reading. *Rosalind* is a part which every well-advertised female star takes as a matter of course, just as every male star takes *Hamlet*. There is, however, a vast deal more latitude allowed actors in the way of putting *Hamlet* on the stage than actresses appear to have in *Rosalind*. Indeed, every new actor is at liberty to get up, as far as he has ingenuity for such a task, a *Hamlet* of his own. Booth's *Hamlet* differs widely from McCullough's, and Fechter's was different from both. A great part of the entertainment in the case of any new actor who takes the part consists, at least for old play goers, in the fact that the performance is sure to be full of surprises to them, both as to conception of the character, the text, and finally the make-up and dress. In "As You Like It," however, notwithstanding its great popularity, all actresses still perform and dress the part of *Rosalind* very much alike, and Mr. White declares that they dress it all wrong. To put his criticism in a very few words, *Rosalind* is a woman passing herself off as a young man, and for a considerable period of time, and under a variety of circumstances, completely deceiving a man madly in love with her as to her identity and sex. The stage *Rosalind*, as we know her, however, dresses so that the most casual observer sees at once that she is a woman masquerading in male attire. She ought, according to Mr. White, to be dressed as men were in Shakspeare's time—i. e., in a doublet and trunk hose; the doublet being a short jacket, and the hose being stuffed out, as we see in pictures of the time,

so as to entirely destroy the outline of the figure below the waist. With high boots, a coarse russet cloak, and a black felt hat with a feather, *Rosalind* could easily make up so as to deceive *Orlando*. According to the text, she should also "smirch" her face with "a kind of umber," and, at any rate, she ought to use some preparation for making it masculine and unrecognizable to *Orlando*. But Mr. White perceives clearly enough why it is that his suggestions are not likely to find much favor on the stage. *Rosalind* has become a popular part for pretty actresses, in great measure because it gives them a chance of exhibiting their personal attractions of face and figure as few other parts do. But if they had to disguise both during the greater part of the play, what would there be left? Nothing but an opportunity for good acting of a beautiful play, which, insinuates our critic, is not what our leading actresses care about, or the public cares to have them care about. Prof. G. L. Woodberry has an article on Landor, and he gives a very intelligible explanation of some of the reasons why he is a favorite with critics, and anything but a favorite with the public at large. The second part of Longfellow's "Michael Angelo" and another instalment of "The Ancestral Footstep" lend considerable literary interest to the February *Atlantic*.

—The "Midwinter" *Century* has an article on the "Evils of our Land Policy," by Mr. Edward T. Peters, who endeavors to show that the railroad land-grant system, supplemented by the "bonanza" farm system, is stimulating an unhealthy agricultural development in the far West, and in some of his facts he is corroborated by Mr. E. V. Smalley in a paper on "Features of the New Northwest." Mr. Smalley's list of "queer names" in Northwestern geography, including such designations as Needy, Glad Tidings, Sublimity, Hardscrabble, Humbug, Louse Creek, Whiskytown, Jump-off-Joe Creek, shows that the reaction against the classical system which gave us in this State Rome, Utica, Syracuse, Troy, and so on, has gone to the extreme of naturalism, and, indeed, from a case like that of Eltopia (said to be a euphemism for an earlier "Hell-to-Pay") a tendency toward a reaction of a certain sort may be inferred. In defence of the land monopolist or "bonanza" farmer, of whom both Mr. Peters and Mr. Smalley fall foul, it may be said that, for the rapid settlement of the public lands, the concentration of large tracts in single hands was a necessity; that if it had been prevented, the process must have been very slow, and to go back now is out of the question; and also that the large holdings will inevitably be broken up into smaller farms as fast as cultivation on a smaller scale becomes profitable. The whole development of the Northwest, as shown by Mr. Smalley himself, reverses what we are accustomed to regard as the order of nature. Roads are made not to provide for the necessities of an existing population, but before there is any population to use them; towns do not grow up from a previous development of the country at large, but are created in advance of the rural population or the appearance of a diversified industry. In the same way the "bonanza" farmer appears first, and opens the way for the small capitalist, the honest yeoman, who in theory ought to precede him, if not prevent his appearance. Miss Emma Lazarus writes on the "Jewish Problem," and strongly advocates the return of the Jews to Palestine, or some national reestablishment of that sort. The Palestine scheme, however, seems to be entirely abandoned for the present, and we know of no practical plan that has taken its place. Anything which would save the Jews from such persecution as they are still subject-

ed to in many parts of the world, would be gladly welcomed by most Christians; but the idea of a people of the Jews' very cosmopolitan habits and pursuits being gathered together in any one place, and settling there to build up a country, is a difficult one to conceive of as actually practicable. Mr. Cushing's interesting "Adventures in Zuni" are continued, with some curious illustrations of Zuni religious performances, and Mr. Howells begins a new novel, called "A Woman's Reason," the opening chapters of which are very pleasant reading. The illustrated articles are all well worth looking at, and the poetry is better than the average. "A Reception by President Lincoln," by C. Van Santvoord, is one of those pictures of the *curia Presidentis* in the time of the Rebellion which now have a real historical value. Mr. Stedman, by the way, has a poem called "The Constant Heart," in which he defies spelling reform.

—In *Harper's*, Mr. Herbert Tuttle has an article on "German Political Leaders." Being illustrated, it shows us what sort of faces many politicians have with whose names we enjoy a cable acquaintance, besides giving some account of their careers and opinions. To the average Anglo-Saxon reader the article will be an awful revelation of his complete ignorance of German politics, and suggest what a godsend Bismarck has been in making him feel for the time as if he were really quite at home in them. Mr. John Fiske writes instructively about "Maryland and the far South in the Colonial Period," and Mr. Robinson, the author of "Under the Sun," which was reviewed in these columns not long ago, contributes an article on "Our Birds and Poets," in which he maintains that American poetry, in its treatment of birds, "is characterized by a tenderness that in the same degree is quite foreign to the poets of the Old World." This he attributes to several causes—among others unfamiliarity with "classical fancies" and prejudices on the subject of birds, and a national intolerance of prejudice of all kinds. He seems to assume it as proved that the world before the rise of American literature was "down" on birds. While we sympathize with them as they ought to be sympathized with, we should doubt very much whether the influences which Mr. Robinson mentions as having produced a tenderness for birds in this country have not exerted fully as much force in England. If, however, our poets are more sympathetic with birds than their congeners on the other side of the water, it may be perhaps owing to the same general cause that has made our artists take so kindly to landscape painting, and this is probably very difficult to ascertain. That the American imagination in general does turn with a delicate sympathy to nature in all its aspects is, we fancy, true; certainly many pages from Emerson, Hawthorne, Whittier, Lowell, Bryant, and Longfellow might be produced to prove it. A general tendency of this sort would make a sympathetic treatment of birds as one manifestation of it seem antecedently probable. The second part of "Artist Strolls in Holland," by Mr. Boughton, and "The Local Associations of Whittier's Poems," by Mr. George M. White, are illustrated articles of some permanent value, and the latter contains some entertaining specimens of Whittier's conversation. There is not apt to be much critical discussion in *Harper's*, outside of the "Easy Chair," in which post of observation Mr. Curtis this month draws a lesson from Anthony Trollope's career. It is one which the literary Bohemian never likes to hear, for it tells him that Bohemianism is not only, as it always has been, unprofitable and disreputable, but that it is "played out"; that literature has

become a regular profession in which, to succeed, you must work steadily and with regularity, just as you would if you were a physician or a lawyer. We may suggest, in addition to what he says on this subject, that as long as most literary men were Bohemians, and lived from hand to mouth, success was determined purely by talent or genius; but now that writers are able by steady occupation to earn a respectable livelihood, the man of genius or talent may provide himself for his struggle with his rivals with a little capital; and a man of middling talent, with capital and the sense of confidence that capital gives, will often beat a seedy Bohemian of genius hard pressed by creditors and other natural enemies. This at least is a view that Darwinians may take of the subject.

—The annual report of President Eliot of Harvard for the year 1881-82 does not lack the customary interest which these documents possess for other similar institutions and for the public at large. Parents everywhere are concerned to know that the graduates of other colleges are coming in increasing numbers to Harvard to obtain the degree of A.B., and are welcomed and considerably treated; that special students who have had no regular college training are likewise on the increase, owing to the facilities extended to them and the rank and honors allowed them according to their merit, and that the President is anxious to have scholarships provided for them; and that recent concessions enable students to shorten the college term one year by more thorough previous preparation. So every college faculty must feel the force of Harvard's example in assuming "for the first time a direct responsibility for the character and extent" of athletic exercises, prohibiting games with professional clubs, allowing no student to engage in an athletic contest except upon a certificate of the director of the gymnasium, or to belong to a boat's crew unless he knows how to swim, etc. Nor will the experiment of morning prayers after breakfast be overlooked, especially since the President vouches for the present service as being "impressive, edifying, and interesting," whereas the superseded service in the early morning before breakfast was notoriously the reverse. Then, again, the Divinity School is to turn away all candidates not bachelors of arts or capable of passing a satisfactory examination in the Greek and Latin classics and the Greek of the Gospels; and its professional equipment and instruction tend toward enabling young men to "study theology as they do metaphysics, political economy, or zoology," without first binding themselves to any theory or creed. The Corporation and Board of Overseers have shown themselves during the year less liberal than the College Faculty—the one having rejected a proposal to make attendance at prayers voluntary, the other having sided with the Medical Faculty in postponing, if not disapproving, an attempt to secure medical instruction for women by means of a fund raised outside the University. As usual, every department would be thankful for larger endowments; but the Bussey Institution and the Dental School are almost pathetic instances of neglect, and are maintained solely by faith and self-abnegation on the part of the instructors.

—Some months ago Dr. George J. Romanes, F.R.S., published an article on "The Scientific Evidences of Organic Evolution" in the *Fortnightly Review*, which was fully endorsed as an epitome of his theories by the late Mr. Darwin, who urged the writer to give it a more permanent form. It has accordingly been issued by Macmillan & Co. as one of the "Nature Series" of scientific treatises, with some additions and

alterations, and may now be said to be one of the best, if not the best, summary of the modern scientific gospel accessible to the reader who lacks time to read more extensive works, but who wishes to know what are the beliefs of the best-informed naturalists of the day and the principal reasons for their beliefs. The evidence for the evolution of higher from lower forms of life is cumulative. The sciences of geology, morphology, zoological topography, embryology, etc., each provide strong support for Darwin's general theory, but together they present a body of proof irresistible to an educated mind. Mr. Romanes devotes a brief chapter to each of these sciences; and besides naming some of the positive considerations, he strengthens his cause by showing, negatively, how the old theory of special creations ends in contradictions, complications, and constant *reductio ad absurdum*. "To withhold assent," he says in conclusion, "from so vast a body of evidence is token not of intellectual prudence, but of intellectual incapacity. With Professor Huxley, therefore, I exclaim, 'Choose your hypothesis; I have chosen mine,' and 'I refuse to run the risk of insulting any sane man by supposing that he seriously holds such a notion as that of special creation.'"

—We spoke the other day, on the authority of M. Ulbach, of the improvements made lately in Amsterdam. Mlle. Marguerite Van de Wiele has written a letter from Brussels recording the changes which her native city has undergone. In her girlhood it was a city of gardens. Even in the business quarters, even in the most crowded streets, one might come across great shady stretches of green, often the relics of old convents; for in the Middle Ages almost the whole city seems to have belonged to convents, monasteries, nunneries, of Carmelites, Bogards, Benedictines, Visitandines, Béguines, Ursulines. Their lands occupied whole blocks, when cross-streets were further apart than they are now; but they have gradually been cut up and parcelled out. The National Bank has taken one, business houses have extended over others, and now the last one is to disappear to give place to a Palace of the Thousand and One Nights, something like the Parisian Edens, apparently, a theatre devoted to "leg" pieces, where magnificent shows and a *corps de ballet* of ravishing beauty will render good acting quite unnecessary. If it is so, the gardens will be revenged some time, for the Palace will certainly burn down, as the Alhambra did the other night. It is pleasant to hear that with these new buildings Brussels is not losing all the charm of antiquity. There is a certain antiquarian spirit there which is very proud of the Flemish houses, each with its façade ornamented with the form of some animal—fox, wolf, stag, lion, as it may be. They care so much for the architectural beauty of the city that the authorities some time ago, during the building of the new boulevards, offered a prize of \$4,000 for the most artistic façade that should be erected—something of a contrast to American building committees, who appear to expect to get good designs for a statue, a monument, or a public building by offering prizes of two or three hundred dollars. The successful façade at Brussels is one of the boasts of the city. Its animal is the cat, and its motto, "Hier is't in den kater en de kat."

—M. Louis Olivier describes in the *Revue Scientifique* for December 23 Professor Marey's modification of the method of instantaneous photography, which renders the process more easily applicable to the study of animal locomotion. The principal objection to the use of the camera as employed by Muybridge is the expense, since it is necessary to have a separate instrument for every attitude to be photo-

graphed. In Professor Marey's method, a disc with a slot in the edge rotates in front of a single camera. The figure to be photographed, clothed entirely in white, moves in front of a black background, toward which the camera is directed. Whenever the slot in the revolving disc comes opposite the lens of the camera, a picture of the moving object is obtained. The plate thus shows a series of figures representing successive attitudes of the man or animal passing in front of the camera. If the figure simply alters its attitude without locomotion, as in the case of a man boxing or fencing, it is of course necessary to give the plate a lateral movement in order to prevent the superposition of the successive pictures. The black background necessary for these experiments is secured by means of a screen, sloping toward the back and painted black on its lower surface, the ground under it being also covered with a black carpet. A piece of chalk thrown through the air in front of this dark cavity leaves its impression as a white line on the sensitive plate of a camera directed toward it. It is not improbable that astronomers may employ this method in studying the flight of meteors.

—A more enjoyable concert has not been heard in this city for a long time than that which was given at Steinway Hall on Thursday afternoon as the third of Mr. Tretbar's popular matinees. The audience was much larger than on the two previous occasions, which tends to show that if these matinees are only continued long enough, they will in course of time become as great a necessity and as popular as the Philharmonic concerts. Dvořák's new overture, "My Home," Wagner's "Siegfried Idyl," and the ballet music from one of Rubinstein's operas, were the orchestral pieces executed under Mr. Thomas's direction. The Dvořák overture, which is fresh from the press, is based on two Bohemian folk-songs, one of which, "Kde domov můj?" (Where is my home?) has furnished the title for the piece. The themes are interesting, well developed and contrasted, and effectively orchestrated. As far as our experience goes, it seems to us to be the best of the sixty-two works hitherto published by Dvořák. The "Siegfried Idyl" is well known here, but it may not be generally known that its leading theme, which recurs again and again, is taken from the third act of "Siegfried," where it forms part of the long duet between *Siegfried* and *Brünnhilde*. Its treatment there and in the "Idyl" gives evidence of Wagner's marvellous skill in presenting a theme from every possible point of view, and in a kaleidoscopic variety of colors. It was well received by the audience, as was also the ballet music from one of Rubinstein's operas, surely the loveliest ballet music that has ever been written.

BANCROFT'S CENTRAL AMERICA.

The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft. Volume Sixth. History of Central America. Vol. i., 1501-1530. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co. 1882.

MR. MORISON, in his clever estimate of Macaulay, in the series of "English Men of Letters," says that "it is perhaps a low minded objection to Macaulay's conception of history to remark that its application to lengthy periods is a physical impossibility. . . . If his plan had been carried out, it would have required fifty volumes, if not more." Evidently such an objection as this has caused no anxiety to Mr. Bancroft, when he first thought of "throwing himself into the arduous but fascinating tasks of authorship." His gigantic scheme of literary labor contemplates the production of not less than *thirty-nine* volumes, of which the six that have already ap-

peared average fully seven hundred pages each. We shudder at the prospect before the "world of readers" of the next generation on the Pacific slope; for it is not "an encyclopædia"—which was Mr. Bancroft's first idea—but "history which he has seated himself to write": "A History of the Pacific States of North America." Hitherto such portentous collections of volumes have been styled "materials," or "memoirs," or "documents for the service" of the historian, in whose deep abysses he is supposed to mine for the precious ore which is to be wrought into a harmonious and beautiful work of art. But this is not Mr. Bancroft's idea of a history. Evidently he prides himself upon his condensation within the limits of thirty-nine volumes, as he says, "it would have been far easier and cheaper to have sent a hundred volumes through the press."

Plainly he could have had nobody but himself in mind when he penned these words. Where, may we venture to inquire, does he expect to find readers in this brief life, or purchasers of his costly volumes in "this working-day world"? The method by which he has undertaken to produce such an enormous quantity of printed matter he has explained very lucidly. It may be compared in some respects to the manner of obtaining and tabulating information practised by "commercial agencies," with whose processes, doubtless, the author is more familiar than with the training and mental habitudes of historical students. It is by "the employment of assistants to bring together, by indices, references, and other devices, all existing testimony on each topic to be treated." To be sure, he admits that "completeness of evidence by no means insures a wise decision." But from the manner in which the hosts of "authorities" are marshalled by this joint-stock literary enterprise, it would appear that for them "A book's a book, although there's nothing in't." To us it appears very much as if a desire to gain some of the "cheap notoriety" which Mr. Bancroft courteously imputes as a motive to those whose judgment happens to differ from his own respecting the credibility of the early Spanish chroniclers, inspired the printing of the list of "authorities quoted"—some fifty pages in length. If his object were, as he says, "to impart a certain bibliographic value to his work," why is no notice taken of the only bibliography of the subject that has ever been attempted? We refer to the modest, but accurate and sensible, "Notes on the Bibliography of Yucatan and Central America," by Mr. Bandelier, published in the Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society for October, 1880. Yet a slight comparison of the two lists reveals many deficiencies in the portentous array of thirty thousand volumes given by Mr. Bancroft, among which figure such "authorities" as Captain Marryatt's veracious "Narrative of the Travels of Mons. Violet," by the side of every speech ever made in Congress upon the Mexican boundary question, and the learned tomes of *Graham's*, *Harper's*, and *Scribner's* magazines. Long as the list is, an habitual searching of ordinary sale catalogues of "Americana" would supply many a missing volume. But the writers most "conspicuous by their absence" from his library are the recent and contemporary workers in the field of early American history, ethnology, and antiquities. We miss the names of Morgan and Powell, of Bandelier and Valentini, of Rau and Putnam, of Short and Brinton, among Americans, as well as of Bastian and Léon de Rosny and Lucien Adam, in Europe—to say nothing of the scholars of Mexico and Yucatan. Does Mr. Bancroft regard such writers as these as "knowing little either of the Mexicans or their conquerors," worthy of being classed, to use his

own civil language, "among those who seek fame through foolishness"? It is plain that something more than negligence or oversight has occasioned such hiatuses in a literary apparatus made at a cost of half-a-million of dollars. It is evidence of a set purpose to ignore the opinions and conclusions of the men who have labored to do away with the reproach that has so long attached to the phrase "American archaeology." But it is an ostrich-like sagacity that supposes such writers as these are not read, even if their names are not to be found upon a list of "authorities quoted."

Nevertheless, we do not mean to imply that this volume and its predecessors upon 'The Native Races of the Pacific States' do not possess many and great merits; and we cannot express too strongly our admiration for the man who has seriously taken in hand such an unprecedented task. With no special preparation or aptitude for this work, and with merely the training which a successful career in business had given him, he has manifested such a love of knowledge for its own sake, such a spirit of self-sacrifice for the future benefit of the community in which he has lived and accumulated his fortune, such energy and pluck and persistency, as justly entitle him to the respect and gratitude of his contemporaries, and insure his perpetual remembrance by posterity. Single-handed, he has attempted and has accomplished a feat which the oldest historical society in the land, with its lifetime of nearly a century, and its membership embracing the most scholarly and industrious workers of each generation, would be proud to have achieved. Alone he has amassed the library, gathered the manuscript material, and erected the building to preserve for posterity the muniments of the history of a large section of our common country. But all this public spirit and energy, with all its attendant success, do not necessarily afford any assurance of his fitness for the task of writing history; and we believe he will never find an imitator of his truly original device of seeing with other men's eyes, and thinking with other men's minds, as a special preparation for historical investigation.

But we will let our author describe for himself some of the feelings with which he has approached his herculean task, merely premising that, so far as our knowledge extends, their like has never before been exhibited except by certain compilers of American town and county histories:

"We of this new Western development are not disposed to exalt brute battling over-much." "Events pure and simple are by no means more important than the institutional development which they cause or accompany." "We hear much of the philosophy of history, of the science and signification of history; but there is only one way to write anything, which is to tell the truth plainly and concisely." "The exact historian [must not forget that] the actions of men are governed by proximate states of mind, and these are generated both from antecedent states of mind and antecedent states of body, influenced by social and natural environments." "As to the relative importance of early history here and elsewhere, it is premature for any now living to judge." "It is historical barbarism, of which the Homeric poems and Carlovingian tales not alone are guilty, to throw the masses into the background, or wholly to ignore them." "The historian should be able to analyze and to generalize; yet his path leads not alone through the enticing fields of speculation, nor is it his only province to pluck the fruits and flowers of philosophy, or to blow brain-bubbles and weave theorems."

This is not precisely the tone of thought or style of language of "Macaulay and Motley, Froude, Freeman, Prescott, and Irving," whose works Mr. Bancroft acknowledges to be "wonderful in their way," which his readers will find to be a very different way from his own. But

it evidently is a crude echo of the half-comprehended thoughts of the "scientific school" of historians of the present century. Of them it has been well said that their principles teach that "the past ought to be examined, not for artistic purposes, in order to compose graceful narratives; not for political purposes, in order to find materials for party warfare; not for theoretical purposes, in order to construct specious, but ephemeral, philosophies of history; but simply for accurate and verifiable knowledge." For them, "simple, unornate statements of the results obtained is the only style of treatment consonant with the dignity of genuine inquiry." Judged by such standards as these, we are forced to pronounce the results of our author's labors not altogether a success. We do not always find the knowledge "accurate and verifiable," and his "style of treatment" can scarcely be called "simple and unornate." Such flowers of rhetoric—"slowly rattles along the dim present, well-nigh buried in its own dust," or, "a varied experience arising from a nearer contact with progressional events," or, "societies formed on one skeleton, a most earthy, red, and ignoble one," "self-begettings of enlightenment," "wavy grain supplanting the tangled wild-wood," and "gardens materialized from the mirage," are scattered through the work with far too lavish a hand. Why the author should wander back through the ages to inform his readers that to the right of sanctuary is to be "attributed in a measure the existence, or at least the importance of Athens and Thebes," after he had traversed in his own fashion the whole field of sixteenth-century civilization and sociology in his introductory chapter, we fail to comprehend. As for his literary judgments pronounced upon the merits and qualities of the eminent writers who have treated of the same period of history, they seem to us as remarkable specimens of the "impudently absurd" as any *jugement saugrenu* noted by Matthew Arnold:

"Mr. Irving has been praised for his genial manner, his gentleness of thought, and his charming style. . . . Among these is found his highest merit; and yet one would sometimes wish him not quite so meritorious. Elegance and grace eternal tire by their very faultlessness. He is too wordy; his details too long-drawn." . . . "Prescott was a more exact writer than Irving, though Prescott was not wholly above the amiable weakness of his time. In the main he stated the truth, and he stated it fairly, though he did not always tell the whole truth. He would fain please the Catholics, if it did not cost him too much."

What Mr. Bancroft's estimate of Mr. Helps may be, we are not informed; but of Robertson we are told that "although his statements are full of errors, intensified by dogmatism, but for which he cannot always be blamed, all who have come after him have profited by his writings." It would be fortunate if as much could be said of all historians, our author included.

Yet, despite such faults of temper and treatment, which may be accounted for, if not condoned, by reason of his antecedents and his surroundings, and making fair allowance for the state of mental isolation from criticism and suggestion in which the work has been produced, we must pronounce our judgment to be that Mr. Bancroft has given to the world a very valuable repertory of information, a most useful assistance for all who would attempt to master the details of the history of the period it covers. We wish, however, most sincerely that he had been content to confine himself to the laborious task of gathering and preserving the materials of history, leaving it for his successors to embody in a literary form the fruits of his toil. But it would seem as if such confinement were scarcely possible for human nature, so prone are men to attempt tasks beyond their powers,

as has been more than once manifested in the kindred field of classical archaeology.

The grave fault of the work is, that it endeavors to perpetuate erroneous ideas about the condition of the inhabitants of this continent at the time of the Spanish Conquest. The author has deliberately chosen to adopt the "romances" of the old chroniclers and the "dreams" of Stephens, in the very face of all the evidence of modern criticism and of recent exploration. He still stands out stoutly for an "Aztec empire" and a "Maya civilization," with the easy credulity of an earlier age. On this point he must be allowed to speak for himself:

"There was little in the social or political systems of Europe of which the counterpart could not be found in America. . . . and there were institutions then existing in America at whose feet Europe might have sat with benefit. . . . Every quality and grade of government presents itself, until full-blown monarchy is attained, where a sole sovereign becomes an emperor of nations with a state and severity equal to that of the most enlightened. . . . Like their cousins of Spain and England, the sovereigns of Mexico had their elaborate palaces with magnificent surroundings, their country residence, and their hunting-grounds, their botanical and zoological gardens. . . . There were aristocratic and knightly orders, nobles, plebeians, and slaves, pontiffs and priesthoods, land tenures and taxation, seminaries of learning and systems of education, . . . laws and law courts of various grades, and councils and tribunals of various kinds: military orders, with drill, engineer corps, arms, and fortifications; commerce, caravans, markets, merchants, peddlers, and commercial fairs, with a credit system and express and postal facilities. . . . Their medical faculty and systems of surgery they had; . . . also their literati, scholars, orators, and poets; with an arithmetical system, a calendar, a knowledge of astronomy, hieroglyphic books, chronological records, public libraries, and national archives."

All this we are gravely asked to believe of a race who possessed no written language or what can properly be styled an alphabet; who were still in the period of transition from the "stone" to the "bronze" age, not having yet even learned the use of beasts of burden; and whose fabulous "Seven Cities of Cibola" have been plainly identified with the Zuni pueblos, whose mysteries and traditions we are in a fair way of penetrating through the self-sacrificing devotion to science of Mr. Cushing and his wife. But this is far from being all that Mr. Bancroft has to tell us about the "Aztec civilization." "The conquerors, when they entered the country, examined with admiration the manufactures of gold, silver, copper, tin, and lead, wrought to exquisite patterns with surprising skill." But he has nothing to say about "iron," which is generally regarded as the keystone of modern civilization. "They gazed with astonishment on huge architectural piles, on monumental remains speaking louder than words; on temples, causeways, fountains, aqueducts, and light-houses, surrounded as they were with statues and intricate and costly stone carvings." Pray, what has become of all these marvels of a civilization worthy to be compared with that of Europe, over which the chroniclers so gloat? Where are to be found the ruins of these "architectural piles"? After the lapse of more than two thousand years, we still have the exquisite productions of the ancient Greek goldsmiths, preserved in the grave-mounds of the semi-civilized monarchs of the Thracian Chersonesus, to delight our eyes in the Museum of the Hermitage at St. Petersburg. What Spanish museum or collection, what monastery or palace has its specimens to show of the pretended equally marvellous workmanship of the Mexican jewellers? Does any one believe that such wonders of skill and beauty and costliness as the chroniclers prate about would not have been

transmitted to their sovereigns by the conquerors, as the surest possible means of winning or retaining their favor? Where are all those marvels now? Have they all vanished in less than four centuries? Why does the soil of Mexico now never give up something worthy of its "ancient civilization," as well as that of Greece, or of Turkey, or of Africa? Who has ever seen anything that can properly be called a work of art that was indigenous to this continent? After all that has been said, the vaunted carvings and statues, the "Chac-Mool" and the "Indio Triste," are nothing more than the uncouth, realistic work of half barbarians. What is their architecture more than a piling up of stones shaped by mere "rule of thumb"? We could scarcely hope to have better proof of the relative position of the ancient Mexicans in the scale of humanity than is afforded by the truthful portraits of them that have lately been disinterred, moulded upon their rude vessels of clay. He must be a very pre-judiced partisan who can discover in these any higher type of race than was presented by the faces of the Zuni chiefs whom we have so recently seen. No; it is all a myth that is told about an ancient Aztec "civilization," if the word be understood in any legitimate signification.

Mr. Bancroft is a stickler for facts. He believes that "the highest delight of a healthy mind, of a mind not diseased either by education or affection, is in receiving the truth." We wish he had been willing to manifest a little more of this spirit by admitting facts like these, which ought to be perfectly well known to him, after the years he has spent in the study of the remains of "the native races." But he prefers to pin his faith upon the exaggerated descriptions, the extravagances, and the wholesale fabrications of the Spanish chroniclers, whose impossibilities and inconsistencies have been so often pointed out in wearisome detail. We recommend to his careful consideration Bacon's favorite maxim of Heraclitus, the Profound, "The dry light is the best soul."

MRS. CHILD'S LETTERS.

Letters of Lydia Maria Child. With a Biographical Introduction by John G. Whittier, and an Appendix by Wendell Phillips. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

THE opening letter in this collection, written at the age of fifteen, at once introduces the reader to a mind of unusual precocity. From few girls of that age do we expect such facility of expression (to say no more) as is displayed in the following lines from Miss Francis to her brother Convers (June 5, 1817):

"I have been busily engaged in reading 'Paradise Lost.' Homer hurried me along with rapid impetuosity; every passion that he portrayed I felt: I loved, hated, and resented just as he inspired me! But when I read Milton, I felt elevated 'above this visible diurnal sphere.' I could not but admire such astonishing grandeur of description, such heavenly sublimity of style. I never read a poem that displayed a more prolific fancy, or a more vigorous genius. But don't you think that Milton asserts the superiority of his own sex in rather too lordly a manner? Thus, when Eve is conversing with Adam, she is made to say—

"My author and disposer, what thou bid'st," etc.

In another respect this letter is as characteristic of the writer as any in the book. It shows the intensity of her attractions, and her extraordinary capacity for sympathizing with that which for the time being absorbed her. Her correspondence abounds in superlative judgments on men who excited her admiration, beginning with her future husband. Thus, in her journal: "January 26, 1825. Saw Mr. Child at Mr. Curtis's. He is the most gallant man that has lived since the six-

teenth century, and needs nothing but helmet, shield, and chain armor to make him a complete knight of chivalry." So of Theodore Parker, and others. The young girl whose passions were so played upon by the blind bard is as susceptible as ever (without having forgot her Milton at fifty-four):

"The outrage upon Charles Sumner [1856] made me literally ill for several days. It brought on nervous headache and painful suffocations about the heart. If I could only have done something, it would have loosened that tight ligature that seemed to stop the flowing of my blood. But I never was one who knew how to serve the Lord by standing and waiting; and to stand and wait then! It almost drove me mad."

And at fifty-eight (Sept. 20, 1866):

"It seems as if slavery would be the death of me. If all I suffer on the subject counts as vicarious atonement for the slaveholders, they are in a hopeful way. My indignation rises higher than it used to in my younger days. According to the general rule, I ought to grow calmer, but I do not. If the monster had one head, assuredly I should be a Charlotte Corday."

Her husband's opinion of her—"David thinks I am preeminently distinguished for the supremacy of heart over head; that I am almost ridiculously a woman in my affections"—was perfectly just. The heartiness of Mrs. Child, in actual intercourse as in these letters, was more conspicuous than intellectual superiority, which nevertheless cannot be denied her, even if she could not lay claim to great originality. It is impossible not to warm to a nature like that displayed in her unaffected accounts of her endless labors in behalf of the poor, the oppressed, the repentant. Now it is a story that must be written for bleeding Kansas, and that being off her hands she feels bound to "stir up the women here to do something" for the emigrants in that distracted Territory; so begs a piece of cheap calico of Charles Hovey, "he himself deeming that money and energy had better be expended on the immediate abolition of slavery, and dissolution of the Union if that could not be soon brought about," but she not thinking it best to wait for either of these events before she made up the cloth, as cold weather was coming on. At the same time, "it seemed as if my heart would burst if I could not do something to help on the election [of Fremont]. But all I could do was to write a song for the Free-Soil men. . . . I have been told that the Boston *Post* was down upon me for the verse about President Pierce. I couldn't help it. His name would not rhyme to anything but curse!" Later we see her ransoming the fugitive Sims by her own efforts, obtaining the required sum of U. S. Marshal (afterward Major-General and Attorney-General) Devens, who had executed Sims's return to slavery. In the early days of the war she prompts Whittier to write an abolition song for an army not yet consciously one of liberation; then betakes herself to knitting for the army, and giving lavishly of her scanty means for the "contrabands." After the draft riots in New York, she turns back a gift of two hundred dollars, that it may swell the fund for the relief of the colored victims of that ferocity. In her will she leaves an annuity to the aged drunkard whom she reformed (herself being seventy-two) and took into her service as her "man Friday."

We get glimpses of her love of music, of pictures, of flowers, of the rainbow. We see the merry twinkle in her eye when she retorts to Mrs. Senator Mason, of Virginia: "I have never known an instance where the 'pangs of maternity' did not meet with the requisite assistance; and here at the North, after we have helped the mothers, we do not sell the babies." Or when she quotes Edmund Quincy's ready reply to her saying (1863) she had never "seen the hand of Providence so signally manifested as in the events of

this war [of the Rebellion]." "Well, Mrs. Child, when the job is done up, I hope it will prove creditable to Providence." A woman who worked hard and cheerfully with her own hands, Mrs. Child could leave her work "in the midst," and sit down "with a dirty gown and hands somewhat grimed," and be "high up in the blue in fifteen minutes" with a Transcendentalist clergyman. "I defy all the powers of earth and hell," she says, "to make me [i. e., 'the case containing me'] scour floors and feed pigs, if I choose meanwhile to be off conversing with the angels." And again, at sixty:

"I have a great many questions laid up to ask Plato when I see him. He has been at the high school so long, he must know a great deal. . . . My soul goes about 'pervading' all departments of the universe, 'wanting to know'; and the only answer I get is, 'Go about your business.' So I go about it. I have just done fifteen pair of mittens and three pair of socks for the Kansas troops. I can trust them never to surrender a fugitive slave; so I work for them with a will."

The revolt of woman indicated in our first extract does not furnish the keynote of Mrs. Child's correspondence. Hardly more than once does it recur, even incidentally, and then in a sober letter to Senator Sumner contending for woman suffrage. Her great cause was abolition. Still, her private thought was ever by choice on matters spiritual, and her most representative work is perhaps not her famous 'Appeal in behalf of that class of Americans called Africans' (1833), but her more voluminous and laborious 'Progress of Religious Ideas' (1855). She was nearly, as her 'Letters from New York' (not, of course, included in the present collection) show, a convert to Swedenborgianism, and never quite lost her drawing toward it as toward Fourierism. She longed to her latest day for a creed, and could never bind herself to any. Some of the most forcible passages in the letters now published relate to the subject of religion:

"Did you see Mr. H——'s sermon, preached soon after his return from Palestine? He thinks the truth of the Bible is proved by the fact that Jordan is still flowing, and the Mount of Olives still standing. He says his faith was greatly strengthened by a sight of them. By the same token he ought to consider Grecian mythology proved, because Olympus and Parnassus are still standing; and a sight of them ought to strengthen his faith in Jupiter and the Muses" (1856, p. 33).

"I opine that we have nothing to do with the question whether the views that seem to us true can meet the wants of the 'ignorant, silly, sensuous, suffering masses.' . . . The Italian peasant woman is doubtless comforted by praying to a doll dressed up in tinsel, which she worships as the 'Mother of God.' I would not, if I had the power, make it illegal for her to comfort herself in that way; but shall I refrain from philosophic utterance lest it should make her doll fall out of its shrine? The doll will not and cannot fall so long as the 'ignorant, sensuous, suffering masses' have need of her. The work that needs to be done is to bring the world into such a state of order that there will be no 'ignorant, sensuous, suffering masses,' and consequently no further use for consecrated dolls" (1873, p. 214).

It cannot be said that with these letters added to the long list of her published works there is any need of a further memorial of Mrs. Child. At the same time, some defects in the editing, which was purely a labor of love, make the work before us, in spite of Mr. Whittier's introduction, an unnecessarily disconnected biography, and even diminish somewhat its value as a contribution to American history. There are apparently a few errors in the dating of letters, and certainly some misplacing, and the time of year, though ascertainable from the context, is not always set down or observed in the arrangement. Some initials have not been explained and are not connected in the index with the full names to which they belong. Certain contemporary allusions, as to 'Sartor Resar-

tus,' the invention of the daguerreotype, the visit of Fanny Elssler, Perfectionism, etc., might have been improved for entertaining foot-notes. Most of all, this work fails to throw light on the problem why so exceptionally gifted a couple as David Lee and Lydia Maria Child did not make more of themselves—if this expression serves to convey the reader's sense of an anti-climax in their public careers. He was a scholar, a classical teacher, a journalist, an able lawyer, at one time a member of the Massachusetts Legislature, an indefatigable writer, who rendered infinite service in unmasking the proslavery conspiracy which fomented the revolt and subsequent annexation of Texas. She bid fair to be the most popular authoress in America, and her recorded publications show a continuous production of books and pamphlets from 1824 to 1878, ranging from works of the imagination to cookery-books, from New England history to the history of religions, from juvenile periodicals (the first ever established) to political tracts. It is well known that her open association with the abolitionists, following her husband's example, cost her her literary popularity at one blow, and made literary ambition seem despicable to her, though it may be thought strange that the author of 'Hobomok,' 'The Rebels,' and 'Philothea' was not led to produce an anti-slavery romance anticipating 'Uncle Tom's Cabin.' This book gives also abundant evidence of straitened circumstances and unrepining toil. It does not show clearly or account for the pause in Mrs. Child's anti-slavery activity between the date of her residence in New York, where she was editing the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, and the beginning of the civil war on the plains of Kansas, or for Mr. Child's complete withdrawal from an agitation in whose beginning he bore so conspicuous a part. Doubtless his temperament was impractical in a way in which his wife's, however strong its propensity to "pervade the universe," could never be. They were a very devoted and loving pair, and Mrs. Child's expressions of tenderness for her "mate," from whom she endured long separation without a murmur, are among the pathetic passages in a book generally full of cheer and courage and hopefulness.

Françoise de Rimini dans la légende et dans l'histoire. Par Charles Yriarte. Paris: J. Rothschild. 1 vol. 8vo.

CHARLES YRIARTE has illustrated Italy so charmingly and artistically, that any work of his deserves consideration. The small book before us with the above title, bound in vellum, with illuminated capitals, a vignette of the first design of Ary Scheffer for his famous painting of Francesca di Rimini, and three sketches by Ingres of the tragic episode, looks very inviting, and yet we see no justification for it. When Dante ended this historical episode with the famous line, "Quel giorno più non vi leggemmo avante" ("That day no further did we read therein"), he had said all that needed to be said on the subject. Any further research or hunting up of family records could not add one iota to the historical fact; it could only bring to light the prosaic details of a painful and fatal event to gratify the morbid taste of scandal-lovers.

The story of Francesca di Rimini is so well known that we need not repeat it here. Dante was a contemporary, already a recognized young poet; he may even have known personally Paolo "the handsome" (*il bello*), as all the chroniclers style him, when, in 1283, he was Captain of the People in Florence. Seven years later (1290), when Dante was twenty-five years old, at the very time when he was bewailing the loss of his Beatrice, the tragedy took place, and the report

of it spread over Italy. One can imagine the powerful impression it must have left on the mind of Dante, whose sympathy, like that of all other Italian lovers, was entirely with the betrayed girl. During his exile, after wandering for fourteen years from court to court among the Ghibelline chiefs of Italy, Dante was finally invited and received as a guest at Ravenna by the nephew of Francesca, Guido Novello da Polenta, lord of the town, a scholar and a poet, who gave him a house and support for the rest of his life, and, when he died, five years after, buried him with public honors and delivered a long oration over his tomb. Dante, therefore, must have known all the intimate details of the tragic event; he may have heard them from the lips of Guido himself and other members of the family; he may have been shown the very rooms where Francesca was born, where she played as a child, where she married the "handsome" Paolo Malatesta as proxy for his lame, hunchback, one-eyed brother Gianciotto. (Neither M. Yriarte, by the way, nor any of the commentators, have noted this additional physical defect of Gianciotto, nor his cruel, treacherous nature as described in the passage of the xxviii canto of the 'Inferno,' v. 76-80. "That traitor, who sees with only one eye," therein mentioned, is Gianciotto, the husband of Francesca, though most of the commentators make him a younger brother, Malatestino, which is an error.) Who could imagine, however, that mention of such a scandalous and tragic event would be the poet's way of repaying the hospitality received at the hands of the nearest relative of the murdered girl? Dante, in this episode, showed a poetic daring unexampled in the history of literature; with a touch of his magic wand he exalted the sinner into an ethereal atmosphere of beauty and pathos, yet used the blackness of hell for a background, so as to bring out more vividly the lovely form, "like a lily in the mouth of Tartarus," as Leigh Hunt says. What is still more wonderful, Dante does not in the least deviate from historical truth, but, although mourning with the deepest and most heartfelt sorrow the fate of Francesca, does not excuse her offence, and she is placed among the lost: only divine justice allows her the everlasting companionship of her fellow-sinner, as a compensation for the deception practised upon her and her forced marriage with the cruel and deformed Gianciotto.

There the figures stand. What has M. Yriarte done for them by his historical researches? Nothing authentic that in any way adds to Dante's Francesca, except to bring her down from a lovely poetical figure to the prosaic erring woman we knew before, and whom Dante did not in the least exonerate. *Cui bono*, therefore, to strive to get at the details, and, after all, with the most indifferent success? M. Yriarte begins with a chapter on the political state of Italy, which, though historically interesting, is too large a vestibule for this domestic tragedy, which concerns only two petty lords of small towns, whom history would have forgotten but for the fact that one perpetrated the murder and the other gave hospitality to the poet who immortalized it. He then institutes a minute inquiry into the ages and relationship of the several members of the family, comparing the historical records, none of which, however, add anything of importance to the simple narrative of Dante or Boccaccio. There follows a long discussion as to whether Boccaccio's statement that there had been imprudence, but not criminality, in the intercourse between Francesca and Paolo is historical or not. Boccaccio wrote some eighty years after the event; his authority, therefore, is no better than that of the other chroniclers who related what they had learned from tradition. Silvio Pellico, and after him every other

author who has written a tragedy or libretto of Francesca di Rimini, have followed Boccaccio, changing, however, the character of Gianciotto from that of a cruel and treacherous man into a sort of Italian Othello. The inquiry, therefore, has no positive result. It is also of very little consequence whether the tragedy took place at Rimini or Pesaro—a question to which M. Yriarte devotes unnecessary space. His conclusion is that, "after all, it is in vain that we pile up documents and go back to the original sources to learn whether she was more unfortunate than culpable, and whether she expiated an imprudence or a crime: it is the great poet who remains the great historian." If the poet is the great historian, why not leave the subject where he left it with such admirable delicacy?

Anatomical Technology as Applied to the Domestic Cat. By Burt G. Wilder and Simon H. Gage. A. S. Barnes & Co.

THIS large volume, by two professors of Cornell University, is a valuable addition to the list of scientific text-books. Its principal object is to give careful accounts of the methods most useful in anatomical work, and their application to the cat, as the material supplied to the students for initiatory practice. This topic takes up the bulk of the volume, and is dealt with accurately, thoroughly, and in a sufficiently complete manner. The book contains the best collection of practical descriptions of the manner of preparing bones, preserving soft parts, making injections, etc., with which we are acquainted. The directions for studying the anatomy of the cat are explicit and well arranged. A student who worked through the book, according to the author's intention, in the laboratory, would have a good foundation for more extended study.

In turning over the leaves, one is first struck by the coarseness of the illustrations, which are, however, accurate, and for the most part new. The majority have been manufactured by one of the cheapest and poorest processes now in use, and are marred by singularly awkward lettering. The names are placed directly upon the parts—in itself a good plan, but in these figures unfortunately executed; thus, in carefully-shaded drawings of the muscles, great white blotches are left, upon which the names are inscribed in coarse, misshapen letters. In many cases these blemishes appear like constituent parts of the object, and so confuse the picture that the eye hardly understands it. (See, for instance, fig. 127, of the ear.)

One's attention is also immediately caught by the very numerous new words, *termini technici*, the number and frequency of which give to the book one of its most obvious peculiarities. Many of these terms are entirely new, and a good proportion are odd abbreviations of old terms; thus, *vena cava posterior* has become *post-cava*. The wisdom of coining all these new words to supplant names already familiar to all the scientific world appears to us questionable. The authors seem to have overlooked the sanction of universal usage, for they endeavor to demonstrate the necessity for terminological reform by cataloguing terms not generally accepted, but used by single writers, often little known. There is an ample series of designations which are employed alike by nearly all writers, and it can hardly be considered desirable to cast aside such sanction in order to introduce new or forgotten sets of syllables. Why introduce *meson* and *mesal*, instead of median, when *meson* (in its various combinations) is already used to refer to the middle germ layer, but never to the median plane? We cannot prefer *cephalad* to headwards. In fact, there is a suggestion of pedantry throughout in the tendency

to a somewhat Latinized style. "Lay the cat on its back" would have been preferable to the oft-reiterated direction, "Place the cat in a dorsicumbent posture." On the other side, we have to say that a number of useful and commendable terms are proposed, such as *ectal*, *ental*, and others, which might well come into general use.

The chief contents of the volume are gathered into an introduction and eleven chapters. The introduction is strongly flavored with oddity; it deals with the method of reference to publications, the decimal system, zoological classification (one page), terminology (twelve pages), definition of terms, the slip system of notes, has two pages of aphorisms, and finally states the authors' reasons for choosing the cat. This is nearly all good, save that it needs great abbreviation. The aphorisms are surprising, to say the least: "Technical terms are the tools of thought" (p. 12); "Correct methods are the keys of knowledge" (p. 52); "Carpenters and tailors do not learn their trades upon rosewood and cloth of gold"; "Fat is the anatomist's worst enemy" (p. 198). The authors have collected three pages of these epigrammatic attempts—we have counted up 65. A livelier sense of humor would have suppressed them. Of the eleven remaining chapters, the first describes the general outfit in apparatus and material; the second gives a general description of the skeleton; the third is devoted to accounts of important methods, which are well selected and written; the fourth returns to osteology in detail; the fifth is myological; the sixth takes up the viscera, and the subsequent chapters the remaining organic systems in succession. The main purpose of the authors is never lost sight of, but, throughout, the text is arranged to train the student how to do anatomical work. The authors are to be congratulated upon the good results of their evident painstaking. The volume bears the unmistakable marks of prolonged personal experience, which has secured uncommon accuracy.

The cat has been already twice the subject of extended treatises—once, many years ago, by the French anatomist Straus-Durckheim, and again, more recently, by St. George Mivart. The former is a classical investigation; the latter is a bulky student's text-book, and is therefore naturally to be compared with the work of the Cornell professors. Mivart deals with the cat from every point of view: gives a full account of its anatomy and the physiology of all its parts; describes its embryology; and discusses its psychology, relationships, geographical distribution, pedigree, etc., thus forming a very thorough introduction to the study of vertebrates; but his book gives no special directions for laboratory work. Messrs. Wilder and Gage have adopted a different plan, giving, as their title indicates, much attention to methods of dissecting. Moreover, they announce as being in preparation two similar volumes, one on 'Microscopical,' another on 'Physiological Technology.' When completed, they will form a whole to be criticised as such. Even then, if the plan of the present volume is continued, there will be wanting those wider views which, in Mivart's book, extend the knowledge gained from the cat by comparisons with other animals, thus rendering the study fruitful. To our mind, the chief defect of the volume we are reviewing is the tendency it has, in common with all of its class, to mislead students into thinking that practical work—the mere dissecting out of a muscle, for instance, and seeing it—is the end of the study. Teachers and examiners in biology are only too familiar with this result of "practical" work, by their contact with students who have only seen a schedule variety of objects and

phenomena without grasping the ideas of which that variety should be only the exemplification. We think that the addition of much more comparative anatomy would have greatly increased the value and usefulness of this manual, while it would have avoided the very serious danger to which we have just alluded.

The volume closes with an extensive and, in some respects, excellent bibliography, which is, however, remarkable for certain omissions: there is no mention of Tomes's 'Dental Anatomy,' nor of the two manuals of comparative anatomy by Siebold and Stannius, and by Wiedersheim, which, with Gegenbaur's (cited), are the accepted highest standards. Only the first, and not the second, edition of Flower's 'Osteology' is referred to, and there are a number of special papers which ought to be added, such as Hertwig's on the teeth and skull, Gegenbaur's on the limbs, etc. Some of the titles, on the other hand, lengthen the list without really enhancing its value. The book has a good index.

Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia. 1861-5. By Carlton McCarthy. Richmond: Carlton McCarthy & Co.

WE think we cannot be mistaken in saying (what is no small praise) that this book gives an insight quite unique into the domestic economy of a private in the field. It is written with much humor, intelligence, and shrewdness of observation by one who performed the rare feat of remaining in the ranks through the war. It has preserved so largely the flavor of twenty years ago that it must be much indebted to notes then taken. It continues the old fictions, gathered from rumor, of Northern numbers, cowardice, deceit, and meanness, with frank recognition of instances of the opposite qualities that came within the author's personal experience. But it is not a book which challenges serious refutation, and these opinions will no doubt be an agreeable spice to the readers for whom it was intended, while they add to its reality to us who think them caricatures. Leaving out these sectional touches, the life it describes is nearly as true of the Northern, especially the Western, troops as of the Southern.

The general reader of military history looks upon the movements of troops as of chessmen, and considers the statistics of losses with the same indifference as the stumping of a pine forest. If he tries to recall that a soldier is a man, with human feelings and wishes, he probably considers that his condition is one of habitual misery, with occasional crises of fury and perhaps agony; that his fare varies from the usual simple sufficiency of regular rations to temporary want and meals of rats and old boots. This book shows, what experience abundantly confirms, that ordinary life in the field is free from extremes of hardship and mortal peril. The outdoor life, the fresh sleep *sous les belles étoiles*, the regular exercise, the simple fare, the constant variety, the occasional excitement, the exhilarating gratification of the gregarious instinct, have in them a charm, like that of the youth which was associated with them, which brightens as the past recedes. The rhapsodies of the author are not exaggerations of the delights of an undisturbed night, a "square meal," a leaf or moss bed, a camp-fire in the woods at night, with its lights and shadows and its thin, blue, fragrant smoke, and the talking, singing, smoking, and declaiming around it; the letters from home, and the luxury of clean clothes.

The author describes minutely the impedimenta of the Confederate soldier, which were reduced to the unprecedented lightness of a musket without bayonet, rubber and woollen blanket, and haversack; and sometimes even the last was omitted. Overcoats were generally discarded as not worth their weight, cartridge and cap boxes

were not needed when their contents could be carried in the pocket, and bayonets were seldom useful. Some of the observations will recall, to many, feelings once familiar. On the march "men of sense suffered greatly from a feeling of helpless ignorance of where they were and whither bound—whether to battle or camp." After the surrender, "a horrid feeling of vacuity oppressed the soldier and introduced him to the new sensations of liberty of choice, freedom of action, full responsibility." An imaginary battle is described with considerable skill in conveying the vagueness of the knowledge of its general cause those engaged in it would generally have. In the pursuit that follows: "Stuart, with a twinkle in his eye, his lips puckered as if to whistle a merry lay, is on their flanks, in their rear, and in their front." It only needs mention of this dashing cavalrman's awkward carriage and screech-owl voice to bring him vividly before us. "A large proportion of the eating of the army was done in the houses and at the tables of the people, not by the use of force, but by the wish and invitation of the people." This, of course, was impossible for the Northern troops, and is only one instance of the advantage of campaigning within the borders. This involves knowledge of the country, guides, secret-service information, defensive battles, and the spirit of resisting invasion. "No man can exactly define

the cause for which the Confederate soldier fought." A large element in this cause was plunder: arms, ammunition, clothes, food, shoes, tobacco—everything coveted by the soldier was to be won by a successful battle. "Nearly every overcoat in the army in the latter years was one of Uncle Sam's, captured from his boys." We think this object had more to do with encouraging our opponents than the religious enthusiasm or fanaticism which our author claims for them. He says, "Discipline, the cold master of our enemies, never caught up with the gallant devotion of our Christian soldiers, and the science of war quailed before the majesty of an army singing hymns." There was never a superfluity of discipline on our side, but such as it was it certainly did catch up with the Christian soldiers. It was not our science of war that finally quailed, and we never had an opportunity to feel the majesty of an army singing hymns, unless "the Rebel yell" be regarded as such. A day or two after the parole at Appomattox, the author, with his comrades, on their weary way home to Richmond, saw General Lee on a lonely road riding entirely alone, erect, dignified, calm, and peaceful. It must have been a moving sight to them to see their old leader—one of the great generals of the century—his famous army transformed into a swarm of hungry tramps, riding without attendants, occu-

pation, or country, from the field where he had just laid down his command, and with it his dream of being a second Washington of a great North American Republic. At the end of the book is a good colored print of the Confederate battle-flag, and a narration of its origin. Nothing is added, however, to what was already known on the subject.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Berghaus, H. Chart of the World. 10th ed. Gotha: Justus Perthes; New York: Westermann. \$4 80.
Düntzer, H. Goethe's Werke. Illustriert. Parts 13-18. Stuttgart: E. Hallberger; New York: Westermann.
Hawthorne, N. Twice-Told Tales. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$2.
Hawthorne, N. Mosses from an Old Manse. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$2.
Hélène, M. Les Nouvelles Routes du Globe. Paris: G. Masson; New York: Westermann.
Hoffman, F. Basil and Adelbert; or, Each in His Own Way. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society. 70 cents.
Hoose, J. H. First-Year Arithmetic. [The Pestalozzian Series.] Syracuse: C. W. Bardeen.
Humphreys, F. M. D. Humphreys's Homoeopathic Mentor; or, Family Adviser. Revised and enlarged ed. Humphreys Specific Homoeopathic Medicine Co.
Hurst, J. F. Bibliotheca Theologica: A Select and Classified Bibliography of Theology and General Religious Literature. Charles Scribner's Sons. \$3.
Ice-Cream and Cakes: A New Collection of Standard Receipts. Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1 50.
Johnston, R. M. Dukesborough Tales. Harper's Franklin Square Library. 25 cents.
Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth. Seventy-fifth Birthday. Proceedings of the Maine Historical Society. Portland: Hoyt, Fogg & Donham.
Monthly Reference Lists of the Providence Public Library. Vols. L. H. Providence.
Olivier, U. The Forester's Daughter. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society. \$1 25.
Parloa, M. The Appledore Cook-Book. New ed. Boston: Andrew F. Graves.

Henry Holt & Co.

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED:

WALKER'S
Political Economy.

By Francis A. Walker, President Massachusetts Institute of Technology, late Superintendent of the Census, etc. Large 12mo, American Science Series, \$2 25.

"Americans have needed this volume. . . . It is not a volume to excite controversy, but it will enlighten the public in reference to economic questions that are invariably discussed with narrowness and intolerance. . . . May be heartily recommended to all readers and students who aim to instruct themselves in the fundamental principles of this greatest of the modern sciences. It is a thoroughly useful work, which ought naturally to raise economic discussion in the United States to a higher level of intelligence."—*N. Y. Tribune.*

TEN BRINK'S

Early English Literature.

Early English Literature (to Wiclif). By Bernhard Ten Brink. Translated by H. M. Kennedy, Professor of German, Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute. Large 12mo, \$2 25.

"We commend it most heartily to the earnest study of every lover of English literature. The perusal of a single chapter will convince the most careless reader that the writer is a master of his subject, and holds all the details in a firm grasp. For the first time since we have had a literature we are able to read its primal history in a coherent and intelligible shape."—*Nation.*

Lyrical and Dramatic Poems

Selected from the Works of Robert Browning. By Edward T. Mason. Square 12mo, \$2.

UNMOUNTED PHOTOGRAPHS

OF ANCIENT and MODERN WORKS of ART, embracing reproductions of famous original paintings, sculpture, architecture, etc. Price, cabinet size, \$1 50 per doz. Send 6-cent stamp for catalogue and supplement of 3,704 subjects. SOULÉ PHOTOGRAPH CO. (successors to John P. Soule), Publishers, 338 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

The Portable Bookcase

(PATENTED)

For descriptive circular and price-list, address the sole makers, LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & CO., 17 Franklin Street, Boston.

CONTINENTAL

INSURANCE COMPANY,

30 Broadway, New York.

JANUARY, 1883.

CASH ASSETS.

Loans on U. S. and other Stocks and Bonds (market value, \$640,850).....	\$315,500 00
Loans on Bond and Mortgage (on real estate worth \$1,062,200).....	379,525 00
United States Bonds, at market value (Currency Sixes).....	1,189,520 00
Bank Stocks, at market value.....	220,025 00
Other Stocks and Bonds, market value.....	986,560 00
Real Estate owned by the Company.....	664,000 00
Outstanding Premiums.....	212,192 98
Dividends, Rents, and Interest Uncollected.....	58,354 63
Cash on hand.....	224,856 89

Total Assets, \$4,450,534 50

LIABILITIES.

Reserve for Unearned Premiums,	\$1,524,123 54
Reserve for all other Claims,	318,545 27
Allowed for Commissions and Taxes due in 1883,	50,000 00
CASH CAPITAL,	1,000,000 00

NET SURPLUS:

Amount included in Safety Funds,	\$1,200,000 00
Unallotted,	357,865 69—1,557,865 69

Total, \$4,450,534 50

Increase in Gross Assets during 1882,	\$243,328 99
Increase in Net Surplus during 1882,	\$151,144 88

CYRUS PECK, Sec'y.

GEO. T. HOPE, Pres't.

